Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force
East Coast Regional Public Meeting
September 24, 2009 4:00pm – 7:00pm

Rhode Island Convention Center
Ballrooms D&E
Providence, RI 02903

PROCEEDINGS

NANCY SUTLEY: If we can all start to find a seat, we'll get started as soon as we get everybody in the room. Good afternoon, and welcome to the East Coast Regional Public Meeting of President Obama's Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force, and we're very delighted to be here in the Ocean State. I'm Nancy Sutley, I'm chair of the Council on Environmental Quality, and chair of the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force. And joining me today on behalf of the Task Force are Dr. Jane Lubchenco, the undersecretary of Commerce for oceans and atmosphere, and the administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Laura Davis, the associate deputy secretary for the Department of Interior; Vice Admiral David Pekoske, vice commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard; U.S. Navy Rear Admiral Herman Shelanski, director of the environmental readiness division for the U.S. Navy; Dr. Sharon Hrynkow, associate director of the National Institutes of Environmental Health Sciences at the National Institutes of Health; and Stephen Perkins, acting deputy regional administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency Region 1. I'd like to give each of my Task Force members, fellow Task Force members, a moment to introduce themselves, and say a few words. So, let me start with Dr. Lubchenco.

JANE LUBCHENCO: Good afternoon, everyone, thank you so much for coming here to join us. We are very eager to hear what you have to say. The other listening sessions that we've had have been tremendously useful and productive, and I'm sure this one will be, as well. As administrator of NOAA, I have the pleasure of communicating the commitments of the Department of Commerce, secretary of Commerce, Gary Locke, and the 12,800 employees of NOAA to the work of the Ocean Policy Task Force. We are strongly supportive of the President's focus on oceans, on healthy oceans, and healthy coasts, and vibrant coastal communities. NOAA has primary responsibility for much of the science, many of the services, and significant stewardship responsibility for our oceans and coasts, and we take that very seriously, and are delighted to be here as part of the Task Force. And again, very much look forward to your remarks today.
NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Admiral Pekoske.

DAVID PEKOSKE: Thank you, Ma'am chair; good afternoon, everyone. I'm Dave Pekoske, I'm the vice commandant of the Coast Guard. I've had this assignment since August 7th, so I'm relatively new back in Washington D.C. But, it's great for me to be back in Providence. I am a Connecticut native, went to the Coast Guard academy. I had the privilege of serving as the district commander for the first Coast Guard district, which is from northern New Jersey all the way to the Maine-Canadian border. So, I'm very familiar with the issues here. And I'm very interested in listening to both our panel presentations, and to your comments this afternoon. In addition to representing Admiral Allen, who is the permanent member of the Oceans Policy Task Force, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, we also represent, on behalf of Secretary Napolitano, the interest of the Department of Homeland Security, thank you.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Laura.

LAURA DAVIS: Thank you, Nancy. And I want to say a welcome to everyone here, and greetings from the 70,000 employees at the Department of the Interior. We are really proud to be involved in this effort to build a coordinated national ocean policy that our country needs, and the President envisions. I want to bring your attention to the handout we've provided you with today. You should have that. And the document provides an overview of the Task Force's charge, and a list of the Task Force members. So, I just wanted to summarize for you very quickly the time line that we are working under, and the charge that the president has given us. On June 12th, President Obama issued a memorandum establishing this Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force. And the Task Force is comprised of 24 senior policy level members from executive departments and agencies across the federal government. You see a few of us here today. The President charged us with developing recommendations on the following issues, and there was an initial 90-day period which ended September 10th, during which we developed recommendations for national policy for the oceans, our coasts, and Great Lakes, a framework for policy coordination of our efforts to improve our stewardship of these resources, and an implementation strategy that identifies and prioritizes a set of objectives our country should pursue to further a national policy. And this is a portion of our work that is available for public comment at this time.

We have another charge that we are stepping forward on. By December 9th, the Task Force is to provide a recommended framework for effective coastal and marine spatial planning, so that is really the focus of our work over the next three months. This is, this open and collaborative process is very important as we are going to be making decisions about the management of the lands and the waters that belong to the American people. You're a really big part of the collaborative process, and we're really pleased to see so many people here, and look forward to hearing your views, visions, and ideas. Thank you.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. I'm going to ask Admiral Shelanski to give a few brief remarks.

HERMAN SHELANSKI: Good afternoon. I'm Herman Shelanski, the director of the Navy's environmental readiness division. I work for the chief of naval operations on the operational Navy staff in Washington, D. C. The United States Navy is committed to being responsible stewards of the environment. And, as such, we cannot be more supportive of the Task Force's efforts to develop a national ocean policy, one that includes ecosystem-based coastal and marine spatial planning and management in the United States. We also believe such management should be balanced to maintain and enhance multiple ocean uses, including those that contribute to our national security, and global security. You know when conflict threatens our national security, it's the United States Navy and Marine Corps team, the 911 force that is out on the oceans, protecting the United States throughout the oceans of the world. Today, there are over a hundred ships deployed, hundreds of thousands of sailors protecting and working out on the oceans today. And as such, the Navy needs to maintain accurate, and very realistic continuous training on the oceans that we sail on.

The United States Navy looks forward to continuing its work with CEQ, and NOAA, and all the other federal agencies and departments of the Task Force to develop a comprehensive and balanced national ocean policy, and very much looking forward to the comments that you have to offer today. Thank you.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Dr. Hrynkow.

SHARON HRYNKOW: Thank you. I'm a native Rhode Islander, and I'm very happy to be back in my home state, first and foremost. I'm here representing Dr. Dora Hughes of HHS. And I want to note that several agencies within the HHS system are very interested and committed to working on the oceans and health issue, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Food and Drug Administration, and my home institution, the National Institutes of Health. As we look at oceans and human health, we see both challenges, and benefits, and opportunities. In terms of challenges, we see things like harmful algal blooms, or red tide, as many of you know it here. These threaten human health, along with other infectious agents that are waterborne that pose risks to humans that encounter them. So, there are a number of challenges that we're facing. We're very interested in the science and understanding those challenges, and finding means to prevent contact with humans and ill health.

On the other side of the coin, we see opportunities. The ocean is an abundance of healthful foods. It's a potential source of drug products due to its immense biodiversity, and the spiritual benefit that we all feel from a nice day on the Rhode Island shoreline, or the Massachusetts shore cannot be underestimated. So, challenges and opportunities. We are very happy to participate in the interagency process, and I look forward to hearing all of your comments today. Thank you.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Steve.

STEPHEN PERKINS: Thank you, and good afternoon, everyone. I'm pleased to be representing the EPA's Ocean Policy Task Force member, Peter Silva, who is the assistant administrator for water. And EPA is really pleased to be an active participant in this process. My office here in New England plays a leading role in restoring and protecting ocean and coastal waters through our Clean Water Act programs, and our environmental review responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act. We've been aggressive in using a Clean Water Act permit programs to issue wastewater discharge permits with strict nitrogen pollutant limits, and to reduce and eliminate combined sewer overflows during rain events. EPA in New England states lead the country in establishing no discharge zones of our coastal waters, where all sewage discharge from boats are prohibited. Three of our five coastal states, including Rhode Island, are no discharge states, and the other two are close behind. We've gone above and beyond the monitoring requirements of the Federal Beach Act, working with states and local governments to identify and eliminate sources of pollution that cause beach closures. Our six national estuary programs, including Narragansett Bay, have worked with other federal, state, and local partners to protect and restore habitat, thousands of acres, including

salt marshes, eelgrass beds, and to restore water quality that supports designated uses like shellfish harvesting. We're involved in two regional ocean management initiatives, the Gulf of Maine Council, and the Northeast Region Ocean Council, and we've been actively engaged in the ongoing planning initiatives in the states of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Maine. Finally, we work closely with our FEP (phonetic) partners and the states to ensure that the multiple proposals for offshore energy projects that include liquified natural gas terminals, wind farms, pipelines, and cables all receive thorough environmental reviews. I'm happy to be here, and I look forward to hearing from all of you today. Thank you.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Before we begin, I'll just mention that the Task Force recently submitted its interim report to the President, and it has been posted in the Federal Register, and on our website for 30 days of public comment. And for those of you who haven't seen it, the report proposes a national policy for the oceans, our coasts, and the Great Lakes; a policy coordination framework for improved stewardship; and implementation strategies to identify and prioritize some issues that the U.S. should pursue to achieve our national ocean policy. The interim public comment period will end on October 17th. We encourage and welcome your comments, both today and in writing during the comment period. Comments may be submitted online through the website, www.whitehouse.gov/oceans, which is listed on your handout. Pursuant to the President's memorandum, we are now moving into the second phase of our work, and are focused on developing a framework for marine and coastal spatial planning. I'm glad that we're here in Rhode Island, where you've made considerable progress in developing a state level plan, as has your neighbor in Massachusetts. We look forward to hearing from you today about those processes, and your interests in our oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes. Let me assure you that we're gathering a great deal of useful information and experiences through these public hearings, and through our public input, that will help us develop recommendations to the President. We really value the input from people such as yourselves who work on, live near, depend on, love, and use the resources of the oceans, and along our coasts, and we believe that it will help us to develop recommendations that make sense, and will work in the real world where it really matters. We had an opportunity a little earlier today to visit India Point Park, just a few minutes away from here, where we saw a thriving working waterfront, and tomorrow, the Task Force, my colleagues and I, will take a trip to learn more about this region's relationship to the oceans and coasts, and about your efforts to restore and protect ocean and coastal resources.

We all look forward to hearing firsthand from the experts in the field on issues, including marine spatial planning, working waterfronts, fishing, marine protection, coastal restoration, and ocean governance. And we also look forward to getting a better sense of the issues around competing marine uses, and how they're being addressed, since the value of these regional perspectives is very important to the success of our process. I know we all benefit greatly from hearing from you, and from your real life experiences, that help to ground our work in reality, so we're very much looking forward to this afternoon. Let me turn this over to Dr. Lubchenco to give a short overview of the public engagement efforts.

JANE LUBCHENCO: Thank you, Chair Sutley. Laura Davis has given you a brief outline of the charges that the President issued to the Task Force. A key part of our business are these public hearings. So, this public meeting is part of a broader effort to engage stakeholders and the public, and to hear views and suggestions to inform the Task Force as it develops its recommendations. It's also a time for the Task Force to learn about, or it's also a time for the public to learn about what the Task Force is doing, and what our activities are. Let me begin by saying that a strong foundation for the work of the Task Force was built by the earlier U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission reports, and the later activities and reports of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative, which took a great deal of public and stakeholder input into consideration. However, some years have passed since those reports were completed, and there are a number of issues that were not fleshed out to the extent that it would be useful. There's also been new areas where new scientific knowledge, new technical developments have occurred. We know a lot more about climate change, for example. There are new technologies for offshore renewable energy, and a lot of new state activities to adopt and deploy spatial planning programs. So, since the commissions reported out, a lot new has happened. We have thus been engaging stakeholders and the public in a variety of ways to take stock of many of those new developments, and to inform our thinking and recommendations. This meeting is the third regional public meeting. We plan to hold another three in different regions around the country. In addition to that, we have already held 25 expert stakeholder round tables representing areas such as commercial and recreational fishing, energy, tribal interests, conservation, human health, science, recreation, business, ports, and shipping. We are planning several more expert stakeholder briefings relating to marine and coastal spatial planning that will take place in the next couple of months. These briefings, meetings, such as the one today, and additional public comment will further inform the members of the Task Force for the final recommendations that will be submitted to the President in December. So, the Task Force has completed the first half of its charge in developing recommendations on the policy, and is now really turning toward coastal and marine spatial planning efforts.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you, Dr. Lubchenco. And, Admiral Pekoske will now describe the structure of today's field hearing.

DAVID PEKOSKE: Thank you, Chair Sutley. Today's public meeting has essentially two parts, which is the format we have been using around the country. First, we will hear from local experts on a variety of topics of special importance in the eastern region of the United States. We will then move to hearing your thoughts and comments. David Reynolds of the U.S. Park Service will lead that part of today's meeting. We ask that you limit your remarks to three minutes to ensure the maximum number of you have an opportunity to provide comments. Those of you who wish to speak should complete the speaker cards that are available at the registration table, and turn them in. For those of you who prefer to submit your comments online, there are computers in the back of the room that you can use now, or you can submit them later at the website indicated on the handout you have all received. You may also submit comments in writing

today. Please be sure to give your written comments to a staff member. Thank you.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Dr. Hrynkow will now introduce our first expert panel.

SHARON HRYNKOW: Thank you. Our first panelist is Chairwoman Cheryl Andrews-Maltais of the Wampanoag Tribe, Gay Head, Aquinnah, on Martha's Vineyard. Chairwoman Andrews-Maltais will speak from the tribal perspective. Our second panelist will be Deerin Babb-Brott, assistant secretary for ocean and coastal zone management for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who will speak from the perspective of regional ocean governance. Third will be Dr. Don Anderson, senior scientist at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, who will speak about research and science as it links to developing public policy. And our fourth panelist is John Torgan, who has two titles, Narragansett Bay keeper is one, and second, director of program and policy at Save the Bay, who will speak to us today on restoration, and ecosystem-based management issues. So, Chairwoman Maltais-Andrews.

CHERYL ANDREWS-MALTAIS: (Inaudible) Cheryl Andrews-Maltais, I'm the chairwoman of the Wampanoag tribe of Gay Head, Aquinnah, on the island of Martha's Vineyard. I also serve on the board of directors of the United South and Eastern Tribes called USET, an intertribal organization representing 25 federally recognized tribes stretching from Texas to Maine. USET President Brian Patterson could not be here today, but asked that I stand in for him. And, essentially, our single message is consultation with Indian tribes, and the significance of it. Since time immemorial, my ancestors have lived here in the Northeast as the original stewards of these lands and waters. We, the Wampanoag people, are the people of the first light. We're responsible for greeting the day, and giving thanks for the first light, and the life that it brings. For thousands of years, our people have lived by, harvested from, and fished within these seas and coastal waters of this continent. We utilized, protected, and preserved our resource in a careful and responsible way to ensure the perpetual existence for use by our future generations. Like all other USET tribes, the oceans and waterways of the Eastern, South have been critical to our survival, and play a pivotal role in our cultural and spiritual traditions. We are connected to all bodies of water as we are with the land, and our ancient history and identity is contained in the lands upon which we live, and these waters about which we speak. We are connected to them, and they to us. Submerged beneath the waves lies the evidence of our ancient ancestors' long past civilizations, tradition, and culture. We acknowledge these, our teachings, and honor and respect the wisdom which they contain. We the tribal nations are concerned over what has been done to the waters and the negative impacts that we're faced with. We have been experiencing dramatic negative effects from the ocean misuse from the Gulf Coast of Maine, the bays of Massachusetts and Narragansett, to Nantucket and Long Island Sound, to the outer continental shelf, the coastal waters of Florida, and all the way to the Gulf Coast of Mexico. We, the USET tribal nations have felt the impact upon our traditional cultural practices, and sustenance fishing and gathering. But, we are here for a different purpose now. We are here to sit there

and extend our help to the oceans plan so that you can gain from our experience, and our expertise, because the tribal nations want to lend our knowledge and our traditional expertise for the careful and responsible stewardship of this precious resource upon which we all depend.

First and foremost, the recommendation is to keep USET and the individual tribes involved. USET is committed to being a constructive partner of the Task Force to consult with the tribes early and often. This is not only a fundamental obligation of the United States and its government development responsibilities with Indian nations, it also applies to all members of the Task Force that, and the federal agencies who will be involved with the implementation of the Task Force recommendations. We're committed to help build the bridge to connect the contemporary uses of our oceans, rivers, streams, and lakes, while respecting and honoring traditional and cultural values, which is protected, and sustain them under our stewardship for all these millennium. We're very supportive of the concept of building a uniform and universal mechanism which will allow for the careful, considerate, and responsible development of our shared ocean resources. The idea of having a minimum essential standards foundation upon which each region could build is vital. The premise of establishing a set of set principles and guidelines which will serve to protect and preserve the delicate balance of the shared resource is essential to its longevity. All too often, we have seen or experienced the adverse effects of having various standards and regulations change within small areas or just in a virtual (inaudible). These variances create inequity in all aspects of the areas that they affect. Typically, they disrupt the natural order and balance of things, and cause many changes. Even the most subtle of changes impacts from the smallest organisms to the largest of our sea mammals. And we've been monitoring these changes and the startling effects they have had upon us. When a resource is shared, traditionally, everyone who has a stake in it has a voice in how it's utilized. However, there's a specific basis upon which this voice is heard. And, in the coastal waters, seas, and lakes, those who are directly or dramatically impacted deserve a place at the table once the table is set. And what I mean by this is, there are levels to developing a careful responsible stewardship of ocean waters, beginning first with having specific federal levels of standard which must be met before any project goes further. These standards must take into account the total and cumulative effect upon the shared resource, and these standards must be developed with the input and consensus of the perspectives, and perspectives of the knowledge of the old ways combined with the new. We use our old ways and compare them with the new ways in advancing and emerging technologies to find that balance and to find a way for us to strike the optimal way of utilizing a resource, protecting and preserving it, maintaining it, as well as making sure that we're maximizing the benefits that they can yield.

We also would like to emphasize the importance of having regional input and local input on these issues because what winds up happening is that oftentimes, the decisions are made without the local input and without a regional input, and they're the ones that are most dramatically affected. We sit in a position to understand thoroughly what the impacts of any decisions, and how these resources are used, and we're offering and asking

for you to utilize that input, and that expertise and knowledge. The tribes would like to also point out that as the original stewards of this land, for thousands of years, we have made this input, and we'd like to make sure that we're able to do it again. So, we hope that the governments, the tribes, the states and local governments can build a better mechanism to balance the needs of today with the demands of the future while responsibly preserving the resources for tomorrow for all of us. Thank you.

SHARON HRYNKOW: Thank you very much.

DEERIN BABB-BROTT: Chair Sutley, and distinguished members of the Task Force, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. My comments will address both a regional and a state perspective. Ocean governance involves many players and sectors, and happens at all scales. NROC, the Northeast Regional Ocean Council is a partnership between six New England states and six federal agencies, and was created by the New England governors in 2005. The purpose of NROC is to identify those issues that require a regional solution, and to collaborate across jurisdictions to find effective and efficient strategies to address these challenges. Priority topics for NROC include hazard resilience, ocean energy planning and siting, and ocean and coastal ecosystem health. Smart and efficient marine spatial planning is one of the key drivers for states to be engaged in NROC, as this regional dialogue provides states with access to the federal agency community found nowhere else. We in New England are encouraged that the interim policy just released highlights the importance of using regional governance structures to get work done, regional associations that include our sister groups the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council and the Southeast Alliance, who we represent in part here today. We are also encouraged that you will turn your focus to a marine spatial planning strategy to help guide sound ocean planning and management in the future. Here in New England, we have several live case studies in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, and lessons learned that we hope will be used in your deliberations. It should be noted that marine spatial planning has happened differently in each state in the New England region, differently even if towards similar ends. And for good reason. At the local and state and regional scales, marine spatial planning needs to be allowed to unfold in a way that suits the culture and politics of the place where it is pursued. For instance, Maine set up a legislative ocean energy Task Force, Massachusetts passed comprehensive ocean management legislation, and Rhode Island is using the well-known special area management plan tool to identify areas suitable for offshore wind development. Public processes, data collection and management, and decision support tools designed to reflect local values were unique in each state. Despite this diversity of approach, there are some common needs that would benefit all states pursuing marine spatial planning, and we would suggest need to be considered in your national strategy. The first is regulatory efficiency. Federal agencies need to streamline their permitting and comment process to consider state ocean plans as suitable alternative analyses for NEBA, as well as be better coordinated across federal agencies during the process so states deal with one set of agencies.

2, for data access, states need easy access to federal data to guide marine spatial planning decisions, which include larger data sets that can provide regional context to state decisions. In a geography like New England where states are smaller than the ecosystems they border, we need federal assistance in understanding the larger-scale cumulative impacts of our individual decisions. Third, we look to federal agencies to provide dynamic data portals and decision support products that can ensure that data used is credible, and that decisions made on every scale are complimentary and do not hinder our individual efforts. When designing your marine spatial planning strategy, please enable the federal community to fulfill these needs. Please maintain flexibility in your direction to allow ocean planning to be shaped by the culture where it needs to happen. And importantly, please help both the states and the federal agencies stand up regional ocean governance bodies that are working to tackle marine spatial planning on the ground so that they may move from dialogue to action in the months to come.

To illustrate those points, a few specific thoughts from our experience in Massachusetts. Under the state ocean plan, one of the fundamental undercurrents was an ongoing tension between use and protection. The baseline objective is to protect and enhance the ocean ecosystem and to develop information to make intelligent decisions. But a consistently expressed concern throughout the process from the regulated community, particularly the uses that the oceans act is designed to foster sustainable and renewable uses of the ocean, those industries felt that the planning process inadequately represented their interests, or that their interests were poorly understood, or that marine spatial planning, in some instances, is interpreted by folks as a sort of slow walk in the interest of conservation over exploiting, appropriate exploitation of ocean uses. It's important that the legitimacy of new uses be emphasized in the ongoing process. Second, working with our friends and colleagues in the federal agencies has been challenging. A recent meeting began with, "We ran it by the general council and here is our feedback." And there's a sinking feeling when you run it by the general council first. We ask that the Task Force and the process enable and empower agencies to think creatively, outside the box, avoid general council's office for the first two meetings, and then do the gut check when you get back down to the end of the day, think outside, and think creatively.

Last, the marine spatial planning structuring process has to be organic and iterative. It's really important. In Massachusetts, three things that we had to do were identify and protect special resources, development areas, and as part of that, fisheries were exempted from jurisdiction. The way we were able to thread the needle was to develop a framework document. That was where we were able to get, organically, as a team, everybody could buy in and be comfortable going forward. We will continue to work on a step-by-step basis. So, working individually and as a region, we're starting to sort through these issues step-by-step. In conclusion, the interim policy is headed in the right direction, it's incorporating a regional framework in guiding principles, flexibility, and centralized policy direction. We encourage the Task Force to continue in that direction. We applaud the administration, and thank the federal agencies and the Task Force for their work. Thank you.

SHARON HRYNKOW: Thank you. I want to commend the speakers for sticking to the time frame. I know it's very difficult, and you have a lot to say, but thank you very much. Dr. Anderson.

DON ANDERSON: Ma'am Chair, and members of the Task Force, my name is Don Anderson, I'm a senior scientist and a coastal oceanographer at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, where I also serve as director of the Cooperative Institute for the North Atlantic region. My focus today will be research and science with an emphasis on ecosystem-based management and marine spatial planning. As stated in NOAA's strategic plan, one of the agency's mission goals is to protect, restore, and manage the use of coastal and ocean resources through an ecosystem approach to management. This differs from current strategies that focus on a single species or sector by considering interconnections within the ecosystem and among environmental regimes. In this context, I note that our current fisheries mandate, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act allows for a multispecies ecosystem approach, but ironically, NOAA's interpretation of the Act has historically been much less flexible. In other words, implementation of the Act is inconsistent with the stated agency goals. My first recommendation is, therefore, that the Task Force recognize this inconsistency and work towards a policy solution to allow the flexibility required for multispecies ecosystem-based fisheries management within NOAA. Now, ecosystem-based management is indeed a challenge. An important tool in this process is marine spatial planning, which can break that ecosystem down into manageable units on the basis of underlying topography, oceanography, distribution of biotic communities, for example. But therein lies several challenges. The first is that the ocean is spatially diverse in terms of depth, water stratification, and movement, and effects from human activities. Furthermore, many species within an ecosystem are heterogeneous across their geographic ranges. Isolation of a local stock or population in fish, for example, can result from the spatial distribution of suitable habitats where the presence of barriers such as land masses, ocean currents, or distance. Care must therefore be taken when defining biogeographic zones since these need to account for subpopulations within broader regional populations. Ecosystems are also highly diverse temporally, and ocean habitats are dynamic. Management zones must therefore be dynamic, as well, changing with time and conditions. Now, what follows is that ecosystem-based management and marine spatial planning cannot occur without monitoring and assessment activities at fine spatial scales that are also high frequency and sustain through time. In effect, we need to instrument and model the ocean the same way we do in support of weather forecasts on land. This will require significant investment in monitoring infrastructure and decision support tools, and is where ocean observing systems and new sensing, mapping, and modelling technologies are clearly needed. Through global positioning technologies and deployment of sensors in space or on-board instruments, or on (inaudible), or autonomous vehicles in the ocean, we can now document and map living and mineral resources, marine habitats, environmental conditions, sea bottom morphology, and species ranges and interactions. So, the framework that you are developing must therefore include provisions for a comprehensive and sustained ocean observing system. In

this regard, the Ocean Observing Initiative, or OOI of NSF, and the integrated observing system, ocean observing system or IOS, supported by NOAA, should be integral parts of the framework. At the regional level, IOS regional associations can provide the sustained ocean observing data for multiple high resolution sources that is essential for addressing many ocean policy issues including climate, marine spatial planning, and ecosystem-based management. I do note that these IOS regional associations are, in my opinion, underfunded at the present time. The Task Force should also recognize that a sustained research program is needed to develop and refine new sensors and instruments. Of particular importance, are sensors for the biological components of the ecosystems being managed, since such instruments currently lag far behind those for physical or chemical parameters. Likewise, the Task Force should support strong numerical model programs, and strengthen ecosystem science. Without this background, we will have data and observations streaming in, but will be limited in our ability to interpret it.

My final point is that many of the foregoing challenges cannot be met by government agencies alone. Strong partnerships are needed. And, in this region, one such mechanism is through the Cooperative Institute for the North Atlantic Region or CINAR, which I direct. CINAR is a partnership between NOAA and five universities, or research institutions, one of the new series of regional cooperative institutes that NOAA is establishing. These institutes are tailor-made mechanisms to direct scientific expertise, instrumentation, numerical models, and other assets to region-specific questions, and ecosystem-based management, and marine spatial planning. I see these types of partnerships as essential going forward, and hope they can be strengthened and sustained. Ma'am Chair, that concludes my testimony. Thank you.

SHARON HRYNKOW: Thank you. Our last speaker.

JOHN TORGAN: Thank you, I'm speaking today for Save the Bay, Southeastern New England's largest nonprofit environmental group, and we are also affiliated with the International Water Keeper Alliance, and our founding members, Restore America's Estuaries, collectively representing more than a hundred thousand people. The need for a clear, transparent, and efficient federal ocean policy, and interagency sea coordination cannot be overstated. Our present policies are grossly inadequate and underfunded. Without a major commitment to reform, we will be tragically ineffective at protecting and realizing the potential of this nation's most valuable natural and economic resources, our coastal waters and the rivers that feed them.

Ecosystem-based and adaptive management are really just different terms for sensible, practical coordination and execution of the work we need to do. Fish and birds do not respect nor do they adhere to political boundaries, neither does pollution. To be effective, we must provide for regional coordination and scope while respecting and allowing for regional differences in our approach. The interim report of the Commission reflects, I think, the right points and priorities, and we commend you for an excellent job given the short time and limited resources available. It

is now incumbent on us, the stakeholders, to give you the specifics of what needs to be done.

The funding need is significant. The stimulus request for estuary restoration projects alone was close to $3 billion, whereas the amount allocated for this purpose was around 160 million, a small fraction of the need, but we've shown, again and again, that any investment in habitat restoration and in environmental protection strengthens our economy, improves our quality of life, and pays direct dividends back to people, by giving them clean water and healthy ecosystems for generations to enjoy. The Providence River outside is a great example of that. We must invest in environmental monitoring, as my colleague said, so we can measure and understand the impacts of our activities, good and bad. On restoration, the way we carry out federally-funded habitat restoration projects needs to be improved and clarified. Today, even with strong initial federal agency support, nonprofit partners need to work hard every year to raise the additional funds, and federal funds, and nonfederal match for each project, resulting in tremendous inefficiency, added expense, and long delays in seeing through vital projects to completion. So, we recommend that there be a single designated lead federal agency for each project that's given the mandate and the funding up front to see the project through to completion. In particular, NOAA and the Natural Resource Conservation Service seem well suited to serve as the lead on estuary habitat restoration projects at the federal level.

Marine spatial planning is an essential tool to achieve effective ecosystem-based management, and it deserves our strong support. We must plan not only for conservation of the ocean and coastal resources, but for responsible and sustainable uses. This means fisheries policies that truly conserve and protect species, and their habitat, and provide for the long-term survival of marine life, fishermen, and fishing communities. Similarly, we must plan carefully and comprehensively for sustainable aquaculture, energy facility siting, and for safe and secure marine transportation network. Rhode Island's Ocean Estuary Management Plan, I think is a good template for the nation on this.

To date, we have failed utterly to coordinate these priorities on a regional and national basis. Let me give you a local example. Mount Hope Bay and the Taunton River form the Northeastern arm of the Narragansett Bay estuary, and have been on the national stage in recent years for both the right and the wrong reasons. First, the good news, thanks to the efforts of dedicated residents and good public servants in our state and federal agencies over the last two decades, we were able to secure national wild and scenic status for the Taunton, and we recently worked with partners to achieve a landmark settlement with the region, New England's largest power plant, Brayton Point, whose owners have committed $500,000,000 to install cooling towers to protect Mount Hope Bay's winter flounder population's fish habitat. Here is the bad news, this same bay and river are now severely threatened by a massive liquified natural gas proposal, Hess's Weaver Cove, which was given preliminary approval by the federal energy regulatory commission, and would dredge up this same habitat, and then dominate the bay with exclusive and completely unnecessary gas infrastructure. There is something obviously wrong with

this picture. How can two decades of hard work by thousands of dedicated citizens who have fought to clean up the Taunton and Mount Hope Bay be so easily discounted in order to accommodate a project that appears to benefit only a private company. And I know this is not the only case of this. Our congressional delegation asked the FERC and other agencies to engage in serious regional planning for energy siting and for the environmental future of the region, and were denied this sensible request in favor of case-by-case review. This makes no sense at all. This administration has a golden opportunity to have real impact on future regulation and policy. These hearings and this Task Force is a strong step in the right direction. Thank you.

SHARON HRYNKOW: Thank you, and let me thank all of the presenters in this first panel, thank you very much.

NANCY SUTLEY: Thank you. Stephen Perkins will now introduce the second panel.

STEPHEN PERKINS: Thank you. Our second panel today, we will hear from Beth Gedney, who is the director of safety, security, and risk management for the Passenger Vessel Association, who will speak to us from the perspective of marine recreational users; then will be John O'Shea, executive director of the Atlantic State's Marine Fisheries Commission, will speak about fisheries and aquaculture; then Edward Fratto, the executive director of the Northeast States Emergency Consortium will speak about issues related to hazard resilience and emergency preparedness, and the future impacted by climate change; finally, our last panelist, Peter Mandelstam, chairman of the American Wind Associations' Energy Association of Offshore Wind Working Group will speak about offshore renewable energy development issues. Beth.

BETH GEDNEY: Good afternoon. I speak today for the Passenger Vessel Association, the national trade association of owners and operators of U.S.-flag passenger vessels of all types. The diverse membership of PVA includes small family businesses with a single boat, private companies with several large vessels in different locations, and government agencies operating ferries. In 1670, my family immigrated to Salem, Massachusetts to build a shipyard. We've been tied to the sea ever since. As the roadways of the Eastern Seaboard become more and more crowded, our country is returning to our marine transportation infrastructure for relief, returning to the water transportation that was important to our development as colonies, and as a young nation. The use of the waterways is just as essential now as it was then, and the marine industry is just as essential to the economy now as it was then. Access to ports and timely transits on the East Coast and all waters of the U.S. is essential to the economic vitality of our nation. Ships, barges, and boats move products and goods and people that cannot be moved as cheaply and efficiently, or sometimes can't be moved at all by trucks, rail, or planes. The passenger vessel industry is a vital and thriving segment of the marine industry. Ferries are an important aspect of the nation's surface transportation system. They provide essential services in places as diverse as North Carolina's Outer Banks, and the offshore islands of Maine and Massachusetts. They relieve congestion in New York Harbor, and

in San Francisco Bay. Many cities are looking to new ferry projects to assist with growth. Traditional navigation lanes are located where they are for a reason. These are the most economical and safest routes for which a vessel can transit to its destination. They must not be arbitrarily moved for someone else's convenience.

Recreational use of our waterways also has a place in the maritime community, and every effort should be made to protect and preserve this use of our waterways. Without whale watch excursion vessels, the public will have much less affection and concern for these special animals. If they never see a whale, or interact with a porpoise, education and protection is much more difficult. If the public never takes a harbor tour, they never understand the size and complexity of the ports in which they live, and the importance of those ports on their communities and our country.

As a government, as you move forward with marine spatial planning, we serve ready to work with you, but we ask that you be aware of the needs of the maritime industry. Ferry operators enter, preserve, and protect our routes and traditional navigation lanes. The passenger vessel industry and its operators must not be considered an afterthought, an inconvenience, or an obstacle when someone proposes a new and conflicting use of navigation lanes. As people and industry look to ocean waters for nontraditional uses -- excuse me -- wind and tidal energy, artificial islands, large aquaculture installations, the possibility of conflicts with traditional navigation uses increases. Unfortunately, we feel this is exactly what happened in Nantucket Sound with the proposal of the massive offshore wind installation. Neither developer nor the federal government properly considered the impact of the project on the safety of the vessels and passengers of the ferries that transit to Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard. The ferry operators and PVA are greatly concerned where navigational safety must, may be compromised. PVA is on record as opposing the proposed wind energy installation because of its deleterious effect on the marine safety of the area's ferries. While all federal agencies involved in marine spatial planning must be cognizant of the needs of ferries and other vessel operators, we ask that the Coast Guard and the maritime administration aggressively advocate for traditional navigational uses when conflicting uses are proposed. We suggest that the Committee on Marine Transportation is the perfect forum for this discussion. PVA supports the concept of ocean planning, and does not -- excuse me -- supports the concept of ocean planning as long as they work with traditional vessel navigational lanes, and compromises are not made to the safety of U.S. ferry and marine transportation operations. Those who promote marine spatial planning must ensure that navigational uses are recognized and protected. Thank you for inviting me here today.

STEPHEN PERKINS: Thank you. John O'Shea.

JOHN O'SHEA: Thank you, Ma'am Chair, and panel members. I'm the executive director of the United States Marine Fisheries Commission, and I appreciate the invitation to appear before you this afternoon. I have previously submitted comments to the Ocean Task Force regarding our commission's views on the importance of improving fisheries and oceans

management in my letter of 30 July 2000 to Chair Sutley. I also wanted to congratulate the Task Force on the release of the interim report. I know this is a work in progress, but from the quick review that I've done so far, I think you're off to a good start. As background, our commission was formed by the 15 Atlantic coastal states from Maine to Florida in 1942 under a compact ratified by Congress. We operate under the principle that states must work collaboratively with each other, with the federal government, and other organizations to protect and restore Atlantic coastal fisheries through wise and effective conservation and management. Our member states actively manage over 25 species through commission fishery management plans. Their vision is healthy, self-sustaining fish populations for all Atlantic Coast species, more successful restoration well in progress by the year 2015.

As for today's topic, coastal and marine spatial planning should be done in coordination with established fishery management entities. That is, the states, the interstate commissions, and the councils. The process should not preempt, undermine, or duplicate the jurisdiction and efforts of those entities. As coastal and marine spatial planning moves forward, state and federal fisheries enforcement agencies must be included in the dialogue. Complex spatial plans will increase the cost of monitoring and enforcement activities. Coastal and marine spatial planning should include as a goal that result in activities enhance marine fisheries and their habitat. Standards should be established to require negative impacts on coastal and marine resources be identified and minimized. Residuals must be mitigated. The interim report's acknowledgment of the importance of cumulative effects is on target in my view. Any new comprehensive spatial planning process must be based on sound science. There must be a commitment to provide the fiscal and the human resources to collect and analyze data, evaluate potential effects on coastal and marine resources, and monitor subsequent impacts of approved activities. On the East Coast, closed fishing areas and no-transit zones have been proven as effective fishery management tools, specifically with regard to Atlantic sea scallops. Given the rebuilding requirements in the Magnuson-Stevens recently reauthorized act, the complexity of many of our fisheries, it is reasonable to expect greater use of the closed areas as a tool by managers in the future. Closed areas are especially useful in circumstances where wide catch is high, and observer coverage is not practicable. These types of things need to be taken into total consideration in any spatial planning exercise. Finally, any significant expansion of aquaculture operations through private investment will require a clear and stable regulatory process. Aquaculture siting must be done in consultation with the states and the interstate commissions. There must be an opt-out provision for states for activities in state waters and in EEZ (phonetice) waters adjacent to the states. Ma'am Chair, our commission staff is in Washington, D.C. By definition, we're linked to the 15 Atlantic coastal states, and I would be happy to help you, or your staff through your endeavor any way that I could. And for what it's worth, the testimony that I've heard so far of our panel, I would say I'm in strong agreement with everything that's been said today. Thank you very much.

STEPHEN PERKINS: Thank you. Edward.

EDWARD FRATTO: Chair Sutley, members of the Task Force, thank you for the opportunity to participate in today's public meeting. The issue before you is daunting. The recommendations you provide to the President will set the future course for our stewardship of the nation's oceans. My name is Ed Fratto, and I am executive director of the Northeast States' Emergency Consortium, NESEC. NESEC is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit emergency management organization. Established in 1991, NESEC is the only all-hazard state consortium in the nation, governed exclusively by state directors of emergency management. The New England states, New York, and New Jersey comprise the consortium. When it comes to the ocean, emergency management's role only becomes visible when the waters rise, the winds howl, and the storms rage. The 1938 hurricane and the blizzard of 1978, what we hear in the Northeast referred to as a winter hurricane, are two examples of historic storms that have wreaked havoc along our coast. We in emergency management need to be prepared to respond to protect lives and property when these or any other hazards strike. But that is not our only role. Emergency managers are directly involved in hazard mitigation or resiliency which is taking actions now, before an event strikes to lessen or prevent the loss of life and property. It is also strengthening our ability to ensure a timely and complete recovery. For example, we promote resiliency for hurricanes by encouraging wind resisting construction, evacuation planning, and personal preparedness. We use models developed by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers as tools to forecast how high the stormwaters will rise, and what areas will be affected. For flooding, we promote actions such as flood insurance, elevations, relocations. We use flood maps developed by FEMA as tools to forecast impacted area.

Now, here comes climate change and sea level rise, and finally, we can talk about it, and begin to take actions that can make us more resilient. To achieve resiliency, we need the same types of tools we use to mitigate other hazards. Specifically, for sea level rise, we need to know the projected height, where it is forecast to occur, and how it will expand our existing flood insurge inundation models. We also acknowledge and accept the fact that the answers to these questions are complex. We recognize that there is scientific disagreement on when and how high the sea may rise, and the temperatures may climb. Nevertheless, I can assure you that emergency managers understand and know how to effectively work with the inherent uncertainties of forecasting models. We need the best scientific information available, and we need it now. What I propose today is that the Task Force consider recommending to the President the issuance of an annual sea level rise and climate change forecast. Beginning in 2010, this forecast would estimate spatially using GIS and Google Map-like imagery, the impact of sea level rise along our coast. It must be specific, and at a scale usable for planning purposes at the local level. There are numerous university and organizational-based research models out there that can do this now. Some are even available online. However, to be credible, the federal government needs to evaluate these models, select the best available, or develop their own, and issue an official annual forecast. Using this information, emergency managers and others can begin the task of making our communities more resilient. The forecast would also serve as an effective public awareness tool. It could

be part of a system of metrics to measure our progress. As we are successful in reducing the causes of climate change, we would expect parallel reductions in the forecasted sea level rise. It could also help illustrate that global climate change and sea level rise, unlike natural hazards, are really man-caused events, so we not only have the ability to mitigate their impacts, we have the unprecedented opportunity to influence the degree to which they even occur. In closing, NESEC stands committed to working with the Task Force and assisting in whatever way we can to move forward in achieving our mutual climate change and hazard resiliency goals. Thank you.

STEPHEN PERKINS: Thank you. Peter.

PETER MANDELSTAM: Chair Sutley, distinguished panel members, and public participants, allow me to express my appreciation for this opportunity to share the offshore wind industry's perspective on President Obama's ocean policy initiative. I'm Peter Mandelstam, and since 2006, I've served as the chair of the Offshore Wind Group of the American Wind Energy Association. I'm also founder and president of Blue Water Wind since 2001. In 2008, we competed and won the nation's first offshore wind contract for Delaware, and we competed and won an opportunity in New Jersey for 350 megawatts. I want to talk today about a number of items. I want to applaud, first of all, the actions of this panel, and the Obama administration. I want to talk about some concerns that we have, and I want to talk about the promise of offshore wind. Really, to begin, applaud the strong actions of this administration, that you've taken to support the development of offshore wind. Interior Secretary Salazar's execution of, a really historic MOU with FERC to resolve the longstanding jurisdictional dispute that allowed the issuance of the all-important M.M.S. guidelines. President Obama's Earth Day announcement of the alternative energy leasing pool, and, of course, M.M.S.'s decision to move ahead with leases for met towers. It was a large competition, 44 or so bidders, my company proudly won two of those, and we're spending our own money to create some green jobs next year to build two met towers off of Delaware and New Jersey. Over the past two days President Obama has underscored his commitment to foster the growth of renewable energy in general, and offshore wind in particular. On Tuesday, at the United Nations, he said that there must be, for too many years of inaction and denial, there is finally widespread recognition of the urgency of the challenge before us. Among the promising U.S. initiatives cited by the President as consequences of this growing awareness with a new CAFE standards, and forward progress, quote, "on our nation's first offshore wind projects." And, just yesterday, in his address to the opening session of the U.N. General Assembly, the President emphasized that, quote, "the danger posed by climate change cannot be denied," and he went on, "a responsibility to meet it must not be deferred." Certainly, I, and all the members of the wind industry want to answer the President's call, and meet the challenge of green energy, mitigating climate change, and, of course, new jobs. Among the most serious threats posed by climate change are, of course, in the marine environment, the inundation of coastal areas by rising seas, the disruption of coral reefs and reef dependant marine life by rising water temperatures, and, of course, the new concern of ocean acidification, and the risk of abrupt and potentially

catastrophic changes in ocean currents with unknown effects on fisheries. This climate change poses such serious threat to our oceans and coasts. Wind power is among the few proven means of combating this threat. Harnessing the potential of offshore wind should be central to the nation's oceans' policy, as well as central to its energy policy.
Let me turn now to the U.S. Offshore Wind Industry. This administration's forceful high-level support for offshore wind is based on sound policy. Offshore wind can, and I believe will be a vital part of the transformation of electricity generation in the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, dampen price volatility, while creating hundreds of thousands of new green collar jobs, well-paying jobs. Indeed, electricity from offshore wind is the only offshore activity under consideration by the Task Force that can make a meaningful near-term contribution to the urgently needed reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Let me give you an illustration from the onland industry. I've been in this business since 1997, I developed the first project in Montana, a hundred thousand Montanans wake up every day carbon neutral because of that project. The wind industry today employs 85,000 people; 23,000 in the last year joined. That's a huge increase. Last year, in a very tough economic climate, 42 percent of all the power plants installed in the U.S. were wind. So, that means that Main Street wanted it, and Wall Street financed it. Even in very tough times, on a capacity basis, 42 percent of all the power plants were wind. Now, those were all onshore, but we've seen the offshore industry, the onland industry grow, and now we see the offshore industry poised for takeoff. And, as one other metric, when I joined this industry, at my first conference, it was 200 folks in a small ballroom in Washington, D.C. Last year, those of you who came, and saw Secretary Salazar, over 32,000 people attended in Chicago. This tells you how this industry has matured.

Turning to the technical side, there's an extensive body of data, including postconstruction studies of offshore wind farms in Europe, which have existed now for 18 years. They've studied these extensively, and they've demonstrated that any adverse environmental impacts from offshore projects that are sensibly sited in accordance with the existing procedures can be localized, minor, and easily controlled. U.S. conditions strongly favor development of offshore wind, particularly off the Mid Atlantic and Northeastern coasts, where we have strong steady winds, well-correlated with peak demand, a gradually sloping ocean floor, ideal for foundations, proximity to states with high power costs, and transmission constraints, and strong public support for clean energy development. In spite of these advantages, the U.S. sadly lags far behind Europe in the development of offshore wind. The absence of a workable permitting regime was the main cause of delay. Thankfully, the Obama administration has now solved that problem. And, last year, I participated with the Department of Energy in a multiyear effort, and last year they issued a report, the so-called 20 percent vision, which talked about obtaining one-fifth of the nation's electricity by 2030. Although I've worked on that report, I, of course, endorse it, I think it's conservative. I think that we can do much more, much faster, and the President has challenged us to do that. And, as part of that 20 percent vision, 15 percent of all of the power, or 54,000 megawatts in capacity can come from offshore sources. Although offshore wind holds great

promise as a clean renewable source, and the support of President Obama and Secretary Salazar add to that promise, the U.S. is not on the brink of a submerged land rush. There has been some discussion in the media about this. Let me say, as chair of the group, there are currently offshore projects in development in eight states. Perhaps 3 to 5,000 megawatts in nameplate capacity with realistic prospects for completion by 2015. These first generation projects are moving forward in areas where states are strongly supporting offshore wind as a way to reduce carbon emissions, stabilize power prices, and create green jobs.

State support has been crucial, and more recently, we've seen support in the Great Lakes region. But, this trend is at a measured pace. Secretary Salazar often talks about the 1.7 billion acres. I'll just say as one metric and offshore wind farm such as the one I'm developing off of Delaware, the turbines themselves, the footprint of those turbines in the water occupy a few acres. The footprint of the overall project is about 19,000 acres, but the ocean uses that are compatible to wind projects continue uninterrupted. So, we see a very small footprint on these projects.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Sir, that's your time.

PETER MANDELSTAM: Thank you. Let me just conclude with one thought. I just want to say in conclusion that the offshore industry wants to work with the Task Force. We feel that this is important to create these projects without delay, and we respectfully say that marine spatial planning can continue in parallel with the specific site reviews of offshore wind projects. Thank you.

HERMAN SHELANSKI: We would like to thank all of the panelists for your enlightening presentations. It's been a very informative session, and we do appreciate your taking the time to share your views with us. In moving things along, I will now turn the mic over to Mr. David Reynolds, United States Park Service, who will lead the public comment portion of today's meeting.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Hi. Again, I'm with the National Park Service, my name is Dave Reynolds, I work in the natural resources sector out of the Northeast regional office. Well, you've heard from the panel, and you've heard from the Task Force, now we want to hear from you. This is essentially your resource. This is, you know these, the ocean resources that you work in, you live in, you recreate in better than anybody else. We need your comments. The Task Force needs your comments in order to make this a document that's a living, real document, and to make it as relevant as possible to you. What I wanted to do is go over the process again, briefly, and let you know that there are four ways that you can actually provide comments, not just speaking today. First of all, I think many of you picked up a flier in the back, it has a website on the bottom. You can provide comments online up until, I think it is the end of October, to be able to, you know, in the luxury of your office, or your home, provide those comments. There's also two computer terminals here if you want to sit

down and do it now instead of waiting. So, you can provide comments that way. And then, second, and third, there are forms in the back that you can fill out with a pencil, pen or pencil, drop it in the box before you leave. And then, last, you can make a statement here, and, for those people who have signed up. We have 70 people that have signed up. And we have to be out of the room by 7:00. So, doing the math, we figure we have about two minutes a person. Now, that, you have to be concise, haiku-like. But, actually, you can get a lot in in two minutes, or you can talk like those car commercials. So, what I wanted to do is call out five persons to come to that microphone, and I will just give your name, and then you give your name and affiliation when you come up. But, I would like the five people to line up, and then after the fourth person goes through, I'll call another five, so we can just keep moving. But please keep in mind that what you have to say is critically important, but what the people behind you have to say is critically important, too. So, we need to make sure that we keep moving, and we hear as much as possible. This is being recorded, and actually is being streamed right now for anybody who wants to watch it, so we could be watched right now in, you know, in Siberia or anywhere else. And again, it's being recorded. And, one more point is that all of your comments will be read, all of your comments will be considered, and all of your comments will be listened to in the development of the plan. Okay. And again, you'll see the green and yellow, that you probably saw before where the timekeeper is up. Green; yellow will be 30 seconds to go; and then red means end it. So, what I want to do is call up people that we received in chronological order signing up, so let me ask the first five people to come up. First is Tony Simon; next is Sean Cosgrove; the other is Chuckie Green; fourth is Karen Weber; and the fifth is Heather Leslie.

TONY SIMON: Chair Sutley, distinguished members of the Task Force, thank you for hosting this meeting in Rhode Island. And welcome to our great Ocean State. My name is Tony Simon, I'm the deputy state director for U.S. Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, and I'm here today representing both Senators Whitehouse and our senior senator, U.S. Senator Jack Reed. With that said, I have a joint haiku, I mean, letter, to read on behalf of the senators for the record. "Dear Chairman Sutley, and members of the Ocean Policy Task Force, we'd like to welcome you and the other members of the Ocean Policy Task Force to Providence, Rhode Island. Although votes in Washington preclude our attendance at this evening's session, we wish to thank you for choosing the Ocean State as one of the sites of the six regional public meetings the Task Force will hold. Rhode Island represents a microcosm with many interests and challenges that our nation faces in developing a comprehensive ocean policy. It also serves as a model for dealing with these important issues. Rhode Island has been in the vanguard of accommodating multiple uses while protecting critical uses around Narragansett Bay. Indeed, Rhode Island has utilized marine spatial planning for decades to zone its waters based on use. With input from a broad constituency of stakeholders, Rhode Island has sought to balance the needs of commercial vessel traffic, aquaculture, fishing, recreational boating, marine trades, and environmental restoration. It has relied and benefited from an interested and engaged public and one of the nation's leading academic institutions in the field of oceanography, the University of Rhode Island's Graduate School of Oceanography. Like the rest of the

United States, Rhode Island faces particular challenges and opportunities as we work to sustainabley manage our ocean and coastal resources. This includes the need to effectively deal with impacts of climate change on natural habitat and our communities thread a point of point and nonpoint source of pollution on waterways like Narragansett Bay, and the need to protect fishery resources and fishing communities. One area of particular interest for Rhode Island and the country centers on the development of energy resources and infrastructure in our ocean and coastal areas. Here, Rhode Island offers an important illustration about how ocean and energy policy can and must be coordinated. On one hand, Rhode Island has the potential to be a leader in the commercial development of offshore wind power through an ocean special area management plan or sampling, a process that has included all stakeholders, and that we have supported with federal funding. This process may one day yield a significant source of renewable energy, as well as the creation of clean energy jobs in our state. On the other hand --"

DAVID REYNOLDS: Try to wrap up your comments, please, I think it's red.

TONY SIMON: Yep, I have just one --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Okay.

TONY SIMON: "On the other hand, Rhode Island faces the potential of being forced to accept the development of an offshore liquified natural gas terminal just outside its territorial waters in Mount Hope Bay. This proposed development has generated significant concern and opposition among stakeholders in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and note that it will be disruptive to many communities, waterway users, and threaten the habitat of critical fish stocks, notably Southern New England winter flounder. As the Task Force continues its work on evaluating ocean policy and marine spatial planning, it should carefully examine the Rhode Island experience in this area, and work to ensure the federal policy ensures collaboration among stakeholders and does not allow, does not allow one interest to crowd out all others. Again, we commend you for your important work, and thank all who are attending this evening for their participation in this unprecedented dialogue on the future of federal ocean policy." Thanks for the opportunity to comment, and we'll submit this for the record.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks. And again, I appreciate keeping on time. And again, keep your eye on the light.

SEAN COSGROVE: Hi, my name is Sean Cosgrove, I'm the marine campaign director for the Conservation Law Foundation which was a leading advocacy group here in New England. First of all, I want to thank you all for being here, for taking the time to go through this process and to meet with us. I really would like to thank the President for sending you here, and I think that all these people here, no matter of the particular issue that got their attention, and got them here today, very much appreciate that this process is happening, and that they have an opportunity to be able to come to speak to you. That's not necessarily been the case in the past eight years, and this is actually a really great way to make public

policy, and I thank you for your commitment to that. I just want to speak a little bit to the interim report. I know that you've worked hard on that, and we appreciate the time and energy that's gone into that. I think it's very much headed in the right direction. We very much need a national ocean policy that protects, maintains, and restores ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes habitat and ecosystems. It is so important that we have a single unifying ocean national policy that has a strong stewardship component. The uses of our ocean are much more important than just divvying up different areas for specific activities, and without a strong conservation tenet in that national ocean policy, we're not going to be able to have the economic benefits and the jobs that we need nor the reasons to go to the coast and enjoy them with our families. Briefly, marine spatial planning, I urge you to look at this as a practice of looking at objectives for different areas, and not just citing activities again. We have some very tremendous places in the ocean in New England, just as we have Acadia National Park on the Cape Cod seashore, there are places right offshore, 25 miles east of Boston at Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary. This is a place that has tremendous habitat, it needs to be protected. This is also a great area to use marine spatial planning as a pilot project, or some other opportunity to protect right whale habitat, fish habitat, deep sea corals, and I urge you to look at that. Thank you very much.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you.

KAREN WEBER: Good afternoon, thank you very much, President Obama and the Council for the work you're doing, and the opportunity to be here. My name is Dr. Karen Weber. I'm the executive director of Foundation for a Green Future. We are based in Boston. I have also done extensive research over many years on maritime fisheries management. I come before you, and all of you today, to bring to light an area that has been overlooked, or perhaps we just take it for granted. Our coast was historically a green coast, one that was forested, had a lot of green plants. We have now planted it with our cities, it has become a set of cement ovens right down the coast, creating desert-like temperatures and climate above our cities. And so, what I am proposing, and what we have been working on as a foundation is to look at the effects of greening our cities, greening the roofs, putting in living walls, getting rid of the plastic soccer fields, and putting back grass, looking at sustainable lawns, gardens, trees, just finding ways as quickly as possible to cover our cities so that the overall ambient temperatures will be reduced by 2 to 3 degrees centigrade, this is work that's been done out of the University of Toronto, that we can go ahead and establish large biofilters that will help reduce the effects of nonsource point pollution (sic), that we will go ahead and establish much better storm water management so that the effluents that are coming out of our cities in large amounts will be reduced; that we can move to a more natural balance of evapotransporation through the filtered system of our greens. So, my proposal is to look at this as something that can be done on a cumulative basis across the coast, and that our government consider incentives, whether they be tax incentives, subsides, whatever needs to be done to go ahead, and on a large, massive scale, go ahead and green our cities, green roofs, and living walls. Thank you very much.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. And while the next speaker is coming up, I want to call up Captain Charles Gifford, David Moriarty, Tim Visel, or Visel, Stephanie Moura, and Greg Gerritt.

HEATHER LESLIE: Thank you, Ma'am Chair, and distinguished members of the Task Force. My name a Dr. Heather Leslie, and I'm an assistant professor at Brown University here in Providence. I want to start by commending you for the interim report. It's an excellent start for the development of a national ocean policy. And, as a scientist, I'm particularly pleased to see a focus on the precautionary principle given the connection between healthy ecosystems and human well-being. I have three specific comments. The first is that the science needed to implement the concepts, particularly ecosystem-based management, within the interim report is both sound and rapidly developing. This knowledge base is illustrated by a just-published book, Ecosystem-Based Management for the Ocean, which includes contributions from 40 scholars and practitioners working in this area, and I've given a copy to the Task Force staff. Second, ecosystem-based management is already happening now, as we heard earlier from the panel. And the Task Force has the opportunity to build upon and learn from these efforts, which include many of the agencies around the table. Finally, in terms of marine spatial planning, this is a critical element of more integrative ecosystem-based management, but it is only one of many important tools. Ecosystem-based management as defined in the report, includes consideration of multiple goals, recognizes humans as key components of ecosystems, and also integrates the connection between ecosystems and human well-being. Marine spatial planning has been done and could continue to be done in a way that does not meet any of the criteria I just listed. Marine spatial planning is a means of systematically and rationally denoting where in coastal and ocean waters different activities should take place. The vision articulated in the interim report and the mandates that will bring it into fruition are what will enable effective use of marine spatial planning as a tool in order to meet both the ecological and economic goals so essential to preserving both ecosystems and human well-being. Thank you.

CAPTAIN CHARLES GIFFORD: My name is Captain Charles Gifford. I'm a port captain for the Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket Steamship Authority, I'm also a U.S.-licensed deep sea master. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to this most important issue tonight and I applaud the President for bringing together an Ocean Policy Task Force for the protection of our ocean and coastal waters. The Steamship Authority is tasked by legislation to provide safe, reliable, and adequate service to the islands of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. Over 22,000 transits transporting close to 3 million passengers, and 600,000 cars and trucks each year. As the waterways become more crowded with potential alternative energy projects, it's important the Ocean Policy Task Force keep in mind the jurisdictional boundaries of all regulatory bodies. These additional ventures have the potential for creating a significant hazard to safe navigation for all types of vessels operating on coastal and offshore waters. Simply moving a vessel's track line further east, west, north, or south is not an option. It's PVA has stated varied routes and other traditional navigational lanes are located where they

are for a good reason, siting economic, safety, geography, weather, water depths as key factors. Operators should not be forced to change to accommodate new fixed structure uses on the waterway. Site of locations of wind turbines, sand mining, and other contemplated projects proposed in all navigable waterways must be fully vetted by the Coast Guard as a cooperating agency to ensure vessels are not unduly hampered by those structures. Also, consideration must be given to the interference of marine radars created by certain structures positioned in areas adjacent to or near shipping lanes and established routes, target swap, radar shadowing, and erroneous information that create risk of collision. A 2004 study in the U.K. for the Maritime Coastal Agency concluded interference with marine radars due to wind turbines found at a considerable and suitable safe distance should be offset. Consider environmental impacts, weather, wind and sea conditions, tidal current effects, and ice flows. The preservation of the North Atlantic right whale seasonal management areas, dynamic management areas, and effects it will have on shipping. That being said, there must be oversight that considers all aspects of safe navigation for vessels that operate in proposed areas of alternative energy structures. In other words, listen to the experts. Commercial recreational law enforcement and others that are on the water daily know the dangers; know the obstructions, and how to mitigate risk of collision. In conclusion --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap up your comments.

CAPTAIN CHARLES GIFFORD:...the Steamship Authority urges the Ocean Policy Task Force to give serious consideration to my final determine -- to their final determination. Also bear in mind the citizens and their lives and livelihoods, thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks.

DAVID MORIARTY: Good evening, everyone, and thank you for this opportunity to speak on this, such important matter. My name is David Moriarty, and I'm a lifelong resident of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and very proud of it. And I'd just like to put a little human touch on the procedure today. The people of the Cape and Islands depend solely on the Sound, the coastline that surrounds us, we are a tourist-based economy, we have no other industry, without our tourism, all of us will be, will, like many of us already are, will be back on welfare, we won't be able to pay our mortgages, we'll be applying for food stamps, and asking for health care. So, I beg of you, the powers that be, to please listen to the people of the Cape and Islands. This is our livelihood, we are connected to the land, we're connected to the sea that surrounds us, we don't own the land, we don't own the ocean, the ocean and the land own us, and they're only going to let us stay there if we respect it, protect it, and preserve it. Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

TIM VISEL: Thank you very much for the opportunity to come before you today. My name is Tim Visel, I'm a coordinator of a high school in Haven, Connecticut. We focus upon aquaculture and fisheries. My students are involved in several projects, and with great help from NOAA and the Fish and Wildlife Service in Connecticut, they've done lobster research,

scallop research, flounder research, they've tagged tautog, we've done some exciting projects. Unfortunately, it's become very clear that no matter how interested my students are, and other students across the country, we need a national coherent policy on fisheries restoration. We find the policies to be fragmented, both at the state and national level, conflicting in some regards, in absence of a clear restoration policy. You have copies of my complete text with some case histories. But, for the recommendations for national policy stewardship and implementation, it is difficult to be the educator and police at the same time. For fisheries, separate regulatory from research and education functions; involve user groups in management and restoration, similar to the Foundation of the (inaudible) Conservation Service at the local regional and national levels. This fosters stewardship like the famous Duck Stamp program with the Interior; designate one agency to operate and fund fisheries restoration service, the goal of the fisheries restoration service should be to restore the nation's fin fish and shellfish resources to sustainable levels. Similar to the training within the industry program of World War II, such a service would be a hands-on agency with the direct application of scientific and research principles. It is to do the work, not permit it. Thank you very much. The last two centuries have not been kind to U.S. fisheries. I know we have the talent to do the job, I see the young people every day. Thank you.

STEPHANIE MOURA: I'm Stephanie Moura, executive director of the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership. Thank you, members of the Task Force, for your extensive efforts. I respect your daunting assignment because we in Massachusetts live and breathe ocean management planning. We're doing it every day. We've been caught up in a welcome flurry of activity since the Mass. Oceans Act was signed into law in May 2008, and we delivered the first draft comprehensive ocean plan in the U.S. in July. Our ocean planning process has been likened to the perfect storm of marine spatial planning. A Herculean task meets massive conflicting ocean uses, limited information, and constrained resources, all of which collide headlong with a nearly impossible deadline. But, in this case, our experience has shown these forces produce the perfect storm of opportunity. Your interim report recognizes that robust national policy must be both stakeholder informed, and science-based. But how do we do that? The Mass. Ocean Partnerships' private-public model represents a new approach for launching an ecosystem-based oceans management plan into action. It's been our pleasure to partner with and support the Mass. Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. The state has the mandate and the authority to develop the plan, the partnership brings essential supplemental resources and expertise to support their needs. So, today, I speak to you from our real life experience, not just theory. The partnership provides funding, strategic, and technical support for efforts including cumulative impact analysis, collaboration on development of a dynamic ocean data network so all interested parties can access current information. And we facilitate cross-sector dialogue to help diverse interests find common ground. In our experience, this public-private partnership model works, and works well. We believe this is due in part because we are not an advocacy group, we represent no single interest, rather, we seek to advance ecosystem-based management for the benefit of all ocean uses. We work with over 50 partner organizations ranging from the Mass. Fisherman's

Partnership to the Marine Renewable Energy Center to the Massachusetts Port Authority, real people with real interests in ecosystem services. Our work over the last 15 months has taught us a great deal. I'd like to share three key observations from our experience. First, nothing gets done without a deadline. More good work can be accomplished with an impossible deadline than an infinite planning horizon. Second, inclusivity is the best preventive medicine --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please try to wrap it up.

STEPHANIE MOURA: And, finally, marine spatial planning will benefit from a national approach on strategy and principles coupled with tactics that reflect the unique character and circumstances of each state and region. In conclusion, the Mass. Ocean Partnership will remain focused on supporting efforts in our state to develop and implement an effective ocean management plan. We hope that our example can help chart a secure course through this perfect storm of opportunity for the nation's ocean policy future. Thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. And while the next speaker is getting up, I want to call up Susan Farady, Robert Cleasby, John Demus, Christopher Swain, and John Williamson.

GREG GERRITT: My name is Greg Gerritt, I'm the founder of two small nonprofits, one is Friends of the Moshassuck, the other is Prosperity for Rhode Island. Both of them are focused on the idea that ecosystem restoration and nonviolence are absolutely critical to the future of our economy, and our communities. If you had come here exactly a year ago, what you would have seen in the rivers in downtown Providence, the tidewater, was an amazing collection of menhaden, there were thousands and thousands of menhaden roaming around rivers in downtown last year, it became quite the sight. In the last week, I have seen five menhaden in downtown Providence, and that's probably five more than anybody else. I look a little harder. All that, that's, the point of that is that fishing, fishes' ecosystems has variability that is sometimes beyond our cant. And we need to just be aware of that in doing our research, and thinking about what we do. That said, I want to make another point. Different administrations have different proposals, different ideas. Sometimes, the infighting and the bureaucracy, among the various components, actually helps the ecosystem. It prevents you guys from doing bad things among each other. And, so, we're at least a little skeptical that a unified policy is actually going to be that good. My third point is that we now let our military, with reckless abandon, kill marine mammals, and if your national policy doesn't actually stop that, if it's a unified policy that continues to allow that killing, then you haven't done anybody any good.

SUSAN FARADY: Good afternoon, Ma'am Chair, members of the Task Force, thanks for the opportunity to comment today. My name is Susan Farady, I'm an attorney, I'm adjunct faculty and director of the Rhode Island Sea Grant Legal Program and the Marine Affairs Institute housed down the road at Roger Williams University in Bristol, Rhode Island. We are just a literal handful of law schools in the country that focus on marine law and

policy. We offer our expertise to you. We are also one of only four sea grant legal programs in the country, and we're also the only one north of North Carolina. So, with that background in mind, a few specific comments. First, I want to comment on the link between policy and law. A comprehensive national policy with strong vision and guiding principles is much needed, as you've heard and as is supported in the draft report. But actual implementation of this policy will occur beyond the national ocean council. Agencies need to follow the mandate of existing laws, such as the Sustainable Fisheries Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and the other plethora of existing laws that we have. These laws in many respects do not align well with your recommendations so far. So, daily management decisions may in fact actually undermine some of the good policy work that is being developed at the National Ocean Council level. I urge the Task Force and CEQ to consider this gap between policy and law to ensure that the national ocean policy is fully implemented by closely examining both existing law, as well as proposed new laws such as Oceans 21 or the National Oceans Protection Act in addressing inconsistencies between these laws and the policies. Second, regarding education, I'm a fan of education, as you may not be surprised to hear, but what we do at the Marine Affairs Institute and the Sea Grant Legal Program is prepare the next generation of professionals. Several of our students are here today, you're going to be hiring some of them in the next few years. There's important work to do, and we need continued support both from public sources as well as creative private-public arrangements, as you've heard about today. Finally, I support many of the themes within the report. I do note an absence of mention of the Public Trust Doctrine. And I think an emphasis and inclusion of the federal government's Public's Trust responsibility will just further buttress all the good recommendations, and your findings, and your reports. Thank you.

JOHN DEMUS: Hello, I think I cut in line, I apologize. My name is John Demus, I'm, I live in South Berwick, Maine, and I represent the Alaska Wilderness League in the Northeast here. And I've got comments which I will submit, so I won't take up too much time because I know you guys got an earful in Alaska already about the Arctic Ocean, but we wanted to thank you for the interim report and its focus on the Arctic Ocean, climate change, and the industrial impacts there, and look forward to working with you, and I will submit the comments, and leave time for other folks in the region. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER SWAIN: Hi there. Thank you, Ma'am chair, and members of the Task Force for giving me a chance to talk. My name is Christopher Swain, I live in Massachusetts. And, at the moment, I'm in the midst of a 1,000-plus-mile swim from Marblehead, Massachusetts to Washington, D.C., so, maybe I can sleep on one of your couches when I get there. I'll submit that in writing, too. The purpose of this swim is to, and my sisters make jokes, but the real purpose is to challenge kids in 50,000 different classrooms to launch projects to improve the health of the ocean through project-based learning. As part of that, we support them by taking 5,000 water samples along the way that they can use to support what they're doing. I'm not a scientist, and I'm not that fast a swimmer, and I spend plenty of time face down in cold, dirty water, so I have lots of time to think, so I just want to share a couple thoughts with you. When

I look at the globe, I see one ocean. It looks to me like we all live on islands, it looks to me like we all live in the same watershed. I can't imagine a sensible person thinking that our fate isn't inextricably tied up with the fate of the ocean. I see two big issues facing us on the ocean planet, global climate change and threats to the web of life. More articulate people can get into that. In terms of policy, yes, I absolutely support a precautionary science-based approach to marine spatial planning. I got that sentence out. And I also think coordination is essential. As someone who has tried to swim just through the Boston Harbor islands, I'm well aware of what can happen when many agencies, departments, and jurisdictions get involved in anything. I'd be thrilled if President Obama fired off a well-written executive order, he wouldn't do any other kind, would he, that helped coordinate all the agencies and departments in support of Task Force goals, I think it would be great. I think it would great if we joined the International Law of the Sea convention, it's been too long. And, finally, I would say, I think we've got to put more resources in the hands of educators. This next generation is going to be here for 70 or 80 years, they're going to decide it. We owe it to ourselves to give them the information and the tools that they are going to need to get this done. Thank you for the chance to speak.

(APPLAUSE)

ROBERT CLEASBY: Members of the Task Force, Ma'am Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Robert Cleasby, I'm the national president of the Steamship Historical Society of America, whose mission is to preserve, record, and disseminate the history of ancient powered vessels. We are national authorities on powered ships. Our national headquarters is here in Providence, but our West Coast headquarters is on board the Queen Mary. Our assets include a research library, a 500,000-item photo bank, images of ships going, dating back before the Civil War. We have researchers and historians at our beck and call. We provide ship images, blueprints, drawings, and schematics. We work with Ellis Island, we work with genealogists, with naval architects, with marine divers, and with the legal community. In a six-month period in World War II, 600 ships were sunk on the East Coast of the United States. And with a burgeoning maritime industry, taking into account the ships of the past and the ships of the future, are imperative to the planning of the use of our oceans. We stand by to work with you, and anyone in the maritime community to provide information on any of these ships. Thank you very much.

JOHN WILLIAMSON: Thank you for this opportunity to address implementation strategies. My name is John Williamson, I have a 35-year background in commercial fisheries with more than 20 years on the water. I operate a charter vessel in Maine, I served on the New England Fisheries Management Council, Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council, and many other reimplanting efforts. Fishing carries some of the heaviest impacts to coastal marine ecosystems. At the same time, commercial and recreational fisherman make up one of the largest public interest groups with a stake in marine spatial planning. Therefore, fisherman will inevitably play a big role in marine spatial planning with the capability

to exert political force to either support progress or impede it. We want to bring fishery stakeholder groups into the fold of progressive engagement in the marine spatial planning process right from the beginning. Two ongoing programs here in the region are worthy of note, and I would like to credit NOAA for setting credent context for these programs, and providing much of the funding for them. One is Collaborative Research Making Fishery Science Relevant to Fisherman. This is where scientists and fishermen partner on hypotheses for investigation, on priorities for research, and on conducting the research. And, second, is the Marine Resource Education Program that, which is a curriculum, six-day curriculum, designed for fishermen, for fishermen, by fishermen. Its objectives are to translate basic concepts of fishery science into plain English, and to familiarize fishermen with fishery management processes when, where, and how they can become, they can be most effective. People are hungry for information, and for connection with science and with planning processes. In the case of the Marine Resource Education Program, we've graduated over 400 fishermen from the program, and we have a waiting list for people to take the courses. These are two examples that I'm giving to, that are, in cases where we're trying to change the culture surrounding fishery management --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please try to wrap it up.

JOHN WILLIAMSON: In the case of your Task Force, you could be thinking in terms of building a culture to support marine spatial planning. Thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. I would like to call up Ted Diers, Janet Coit, Tom Flandigan, Berl Hartman, and Chris Mann. And I wanted to say, too, that if anybody who signed up wanted to check where they are on the list, we have a duplicate list in the back at the speakers' table if you want to find out, if you need to run out and use the bathroom or whatever. So, Ted.

TED DIERS: Ocean Task Force, Coastal States Organization, a happy cheer we share.

(APPLAUSE)

TED DIERS: All right. I'm sorry, I'm not a poet, I'm actually Ted Diers, and I'm the current chair of the Coastal States Organization. We will be submitting a written testimony for both the Ocean Task Force Policy, and also on marine spatial planning. Coastal Zone Management Act, I would just like to point out a couple of things. The Coastal Zone Management Act could be a potential vehicle for delivery of services and resources relative to your new policy that you're creating. And I hope you will consider it that way, and the Coastal Agencies partners in that. I hope that you will consider, also, looking, and I know you have in your interim policy, looking at the regional ocean partnerships. The states have been taking a lead on this, we've been leading the charge, and we will continue to do so. We like this stuff, it's fun, in a few months, I'll be the chair of our regional ocean council here in the Northeast, and I look forward to working with you as we start to implement some of this

stuff. We need an ocean trust fund. We also really need to take a look at climate change and hazards as they relate to both the oceans and coastal areas. Finally, you federal agencies are very busy dealing with offshore renewables and offshore energy. One of the reasons you're busy is because we're busy. In the states, we're also very busy. Our capacity is stretched. I wear the hat of Coastal States Organization, I'm also wearing the hat of NROC, I'm also wearing the hat of the Gulf of Maine Council, all of those hats are wearing down my head, but it's, the only reason I say that is because capacity issues in states are real. We're dealing with lots of these new issues, climate change issues, ocean renewable issues, this is a tremendous tax on us through the interstate agencies, and we really need some assistance with that. And I really appreciate all of the time you're spending doing this public outreach. This is really terrific. Thank you.

JANET COIT: Good evening, my name is Janet Coit, and I'm representing the Nature Conservancy in Rhode Island and across the Atlantic coast. The Nature Conservancy has 500 staff working on more than 150 marine restoration and conservation projects worldwide. Here in Rhode Island, we've restored over 80,000 -- 80,000 pounds of hard clams into the Atlantic coast as part of an Atlantic coastwide effort to restore shellfish. Please scale up funding for restoration, it's important for resilient coastal habitats. The Conservancy applauds your work, and supports a marine policy that adopts conservation of living marine resources and biodiversity as a core principle. I'd like to highlight two essential tools. First, we think a regional approach is extremely important in implementing these policies. I know you're familiar with NROC, MARCO in the Mid-Atlantic, and the South-Atlantic Alliance. We think these regional entities provide the opportunity to reach across political boundaries, and look at an ecosystem scale, and we hope you will provide funding and create incentives for these regional bodies to work on implementing the national oceans policy. Second, like so many here, we support marine spatial planning as a tool to use to work on ecosystem-based management. Of course, as you balance multiple uses for marine spatial planning, this tool, in order to be effective in the long-term, requires that we underscore the protection of important ecosystems and habitats as a core principle. We've convened five MSP workshops recently, one in Providence, we have one coming up in Charleston, South Carolina next week, and we've heard from hundreds of experts who have emphasized best available science, a transparent stakeholder process, adaptive management, integration across sectors, strong monitoring, cumulative impacts assessment, and, of course, precautionary and participatory management. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify, and I wish you the best of luck.

TOM FLANDIGAN: Hi, my name is -- I'm not that tall. My name is Tom Flandigan, I am the director of the South Coast Community Collaborative Design Studio. This is an initiative, a capacity-building initiative of the Community Foundation of Southeastern Massachusetts in New Bedford, I live here in Rhode Island. Distinguished members of the Task Force, when you finish your work, the Task Force will be dissolved. But, the policy coordination frameworks that you put into place will have a long and influential life. It's for this reason that I ask that you include in

your recommendations a continuous quality improvement provision for the framework, itself. I'm specifically asking that you convene a national forum that looks at collaborative design and decision making methodologies. I'm certain you've been besieged by consultants offering you these solutions, but I think it's time to benchmark them. The wisdom of this provision will not only express itself in the increasing efficiency and efficacy of ocean policy, but it can improve policy making across the broad spectrum of social issues that confront us. Thank you.

BERL HARTMAN: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here. My name is Berl Hartman, I am the co-founder and leader of the New England Chapter of Environmental Entrepreneurs. We are the business voice for the environment. We're a group of national business and professional leaders who believe in good economic policy based on its economic merits. Collectively, we have founded over 1,200 businesses, which in turn have created over 400,000 jobs, and we currently manage over $20 billion under management. I'm here today to make three key points. First of all, our oceans are a tremendous economic resource. They provide billions and billions of dollars in jobs, in recreation, and here in New England, perhaps more than any other region of the country, we rely on our ocean for foods, jobs, recreation, and quality of life. So, they're very, very important to the members of my community, and, in fact, throughout the country. Secondly, America's oceans are absolutely in crisis. Our fish populations are dwindling, our beaches are often closed, sea temperatures and levels are rising, habitats and coral reefs are shrinking,everything is going wrong. You guys have a lot of work to do. Thirdly, what we need most is a clear and coherent and strong policy to protect and restore our oceans. Imagine if the oceans were a multibillion-dollar corporation, which, in a sense, it is, but it's running without a board of directors, without a mission statement, without a charter, without even a CEO. So, it's amazing that we haven't gone bankrupt, but, in effect, we are going bankrupt. So, we need to give our oceans the attention, funding, and management they deserve. Implementation of the Task Force's recommendations will need to be followed with legislative action to ensure an ongoing regulatory structure with funding and a continuing mandate of the force of law. Thank you.

95

DAVID REYNOLDS: While the next speaker comes up, I'd like to call up Margo Pellegrino; Sarah, it's either Chasis, or Chasis; Patrick Paquette; Warren Doty; and Susan Olcott.

CHRIS MANN: Hi. I'm Chris Mann with the Pew Environment Group, and I got beaten to the punch on the haiku, but, nonetheless, I'll offer my feeble attempt. Oceans of cerulean, once endless in their bounty, save them for us all. I wanted to just thank you for the hard work you have done, and that of your staff. I think we're all keenly aware of the amount of work that went into this. Obviously, there remain a lot of hard work ahead as we describe how to protect our oceans, but you have very effectively articulated, I believe, what we need to do to protect our oceans. And, last Thursday, as has been noted, was a truly historic day in that for the first time, many federal agencies whose activities affect the oceans came together to recommend a unified policy that makes the protection of marine ecosystem health a priority. And that's important because in the end, we

can drill for oil, we can ship cargo across a warm dead ocean, but we can't fish in it, and you wouldn't want to swim in it, and we need to protect the full suite of values that are so important to our economy, and protect the ecological services that can't be replaced at any price. So, we look forward to working with you, to create a regional marine planning framework that will provide the real benefits in and on the water to translate that policy into reality. And, in the end, that will be the true measure of the success of this endeavor. So, thank you very much, and keep up the great work.

MARGO PELLEGRINO: Hi. Thank you for holding this hearing, and I hope I can read my notes. I don't usually prepare written statements. My name is Margo Pellegrino, and I'd like to add my voice to the growing chorus of national ocean policy advocates. I'm an active Surf Rider Foundation Member, a stay-at-home mom, and an avid paddler. Between 2007 and this past spring, I paddled over 3,500 miles of coastal and intercoastal waterways, from Miami to Maine, from the Jersey shore to D.C., and from Miami to New Orleans. I am not so sure how marine spatial planning would address the many problems that I have seen in our waterways, and along our coasts. Here is a snippet of some of the things I've seen, brand-new homes with septic tanks built on recently storm-damaged beaches in Florida; manatees narrowly escaping being struck by speeding boats in the ICW in Florida; a group of fishermen laughing at me after I've asked if they'll eat what they catch in the Indian River Lagoon. "No, too many worms in them to make it worthwhile," they said; a dead loggerhead in a net in the Core Sound of North Carolina; an angry fisherman behind Hatteras in North Carolina complaining about catch restrictions, then complaining that he only caught five flounder, all in the same breath. The list continues. Plastic wrappers, plastic bags, plastic bottles, plastic parts of who knows what, everywhere there are people, and even where there are not. Who knew I was Dr. Suess. An outraged crabber in Georgia, furious that the paper mills were granted yet another waiver to pollute stinky red tide water in various Northeast -- New England harbors. And 2007 was not a good year if you wanted to eat locally caught Ipswich Clams in Gloucester. Dirty, grimy water in Annapolis, in the Potomac, in the Chesapeake, where sporting a gashed thumb, the weather, which was horrible last year, suddenly became a nonissue. It seemed everyone at my Chesapeake Beach stop in Maryland knew someone who knew someone who had a worst-case scenario, and had to have a limb amputated from an infection from the water. This year, I paddled into Apalachicola the same day the oyster beds were closed due to increased runoff and bacteria.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Could you please wrap it up.

MARGO PELLEGRINO: Okay. Obviously, the marshlands are sinking in Louisiana because, really, who would build a railroad bridge so low that I almost hit my head going under it into Lake Pontchartrain. I am not sure how dividing the ocean into various slices of pie will help solve the current levels of degradation in our coastal areas that we are currently seeing. Shouldn't we properly fix things before we render them irreparable. Let's get ecosystem-based management right before we risk dividing an empty pie plate. Thank you.

SARAH CHASIS: Good afternoon, Chair Sutley, Dr. Lubchenco, and other members of the Task Force. I'm Sarah Chasis, I direct the oceans program for the Natural Resources Defense Council. I traveled up from New York for today's hearing. Like the Clean Air Act for our air, and the Clean Water Act for our water, we need a national ocean policy for our oceans. The mission and work that you have embarked on is incredibly important, and really historic, and we applaud the work you've done to date, as revealed in the interim report that you issued last week. That report, in our view, laid out a comprehensive, detailed plan for increasing and improving ocean stewardship. We would like to urge you to move quickly after the comment period is complete to finalize your recommendations, and we encourage President Obama to issue, expeditiously, an executive order, which memorializes that national ocean policy, establishes a national ocean council, as you've proposed in your report, and also, directs the constituent agencies of the federal government to implement the policy and principles as they carry about, go about their day-to-day decision making. I'd just like to mention three areas where I can see this national ocean policy making a huge difference. One is on ocean acidification. The focus is very much as it should be on the need to curb emissions, to reduce the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere, but the other thing that's so important is to improve and increase the resiliency of our oceans so that they can better withstand the stress of climate change and ocean acidification. A national ocean policy will help that. Secondly, dealing with the incredible interest and pressure for increasing energy, renewable energy in our oceans, and N.R.D.C. is very supportive of this drive, but we also are cognizant that our important habitats, fisheries, and other resources need to be protected in the process. A national ocean policy can help. And finally, along the continental shelf, in this part of the country, from Massachusetts down to Virginia and North Carolina, we have a set of submarine canyons that contain wonderful Benthic life, deep sea corals, anemones, sponges, and are home to whales, dolphins, and others that feed on the squid in there, and these are facing significant threats from, as bottom-trol technology increases, as oil and gas drilling is being considered. A comprehensive ocean policy can help properly protect those areas. We thank you for the historic work you're engaged in, and look forward to working with you. Thank you.

PATRICK PAQUETTE: Good evening. My name is Patrick Paquette, I'm a professional advocate representing the recreational fishing community of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I wear many, many, many hats representing our community, and I find myself just going over, and over, and over, listening to the comments today about what I see that I hope will help you. And we will be submitting detailed written comments. I need you to know that I participated in the Massachusetts Oceans Plan Development all the way back when it was the first draft of the O'Leary bill. I helped craft some of the language that ended up passing in that bill, and I have watched both the benefits and distractions that have affected our development of what we hope is going to be the cutting-edge ocean management plan in this country. That being said, we continue to make great mistakes in developing that plan. Recreational community in Massachusetts has had, the organized community, has been incorporated and had multiple stakeholder groups since the 1940s. However, none of those groups, outside of the Massachusetts Striped Bass Association, our

political voice, are aware of the plan's development. It's not because there hasn't been attempts to reach us, it's because they haven't been done by the right people. No one came to us and asked us, "Hey, we're developing this, how do we do it?" No one said, "Hey, how do we help you guys help us do it?" We had to fight just to get that done. Deerin Babb-Brott earlier testified about those difficulties. Communication remains our number one problem. The ESA protects animals, but we see it politicized and used. If the Task Force's job and end result is to produce another bill or another policy that rips us apart as all stakeholders, that prohibits our uses, and doesn't engage us, we'll fail, we'll all fail. The recreational fishing community wants to be able to have wind farms and fish next to them just like we fish next to oil platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. That works for us. We don't want to be told we have to stay four miles away from them. We want sustainable fisheries, but that doesn't mean that we want no-take marine reserves based on science that we're told is incomplete on a regular basis while we continue to offer the largest potential source of cooperative data collection on the planet. And no one wants to help us help them.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Can you wrap it up now.

PATRICK PAQUETTE:...as those in charge with putting this, please do not leave recreational organizations aside. Use us as a resource, and you will find that many of your solutions, just like in striped bass, and just like, when I was a child, Boston Harbor was the dirtiest water in the United States. It was only when our protesting, when the Massachusetts Striped Bass Association's protesting was joined by the Conservation Law Foundation, was joined by Save The Harbor/Save the Bay, when, together, the lawsuits were written, when, eventually, now we have a national park in that place. We continue to make strides when we're all together.

DAVID REYNOLDS: You need to --

PATRICK PAQUETTE: ...something that's going to get us together, and not prohibit us from working together.

WARREN DOTY: My name is Warren Doty, I'm a selectman from the island of Martha's Vineyard, and also a founding director of the Martha's Vineyard, Dukes County Commercial Fisherman Association. I could speak on many parts of this interim report, but I'd like to just take my one minute to emphasize what Don Anderson said from Woods Hole Oceanographic earlier. We need ecosystem-based management. I've just come from two days of meetings at the New England Fisheries Management Council, we debated if fisheries planned for scallops, then we debated if fisheries planned for yellowtail flounder, then we developed a fisheries management plan for herring, then we discussed a fisheries management plan for red crab. At Atlantic State's Marine Fisheries Commission, they're debating a plan for menhaden, they're debating a plan for lobster, they're debating a plan for striped bass. All of these debates are going on as if the striped bass lived in the water by themselves. And that's certainly true for management plans that have been developed with all of our fisheries councils. There's a lot of talk about ecosystem-based management, but that style of management has not made it to the council level, at least

not in New England. And if there is an interest in ecosystem-based management, we have to act as if all of our fish species live in the water together, and interact with one another. And that's the challenge for Dr. Lubchenco.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. And I'd like to call up Chuckie Green, Wendell Brown, Christin Reynolds, Mason Weinrich, Carl Pellegrino, andm Regina Asmutis-Silvia. And I'd like to remind you too, just looking at the numbers, we have 70 people. This will make 30. It's ten past 6:00. So, we really need to stay on time as far as keeping the numbers. Thanks.
SUSAN OLCOTT: Good afternoon. My name is Susan Olcott, and I'm speaking today on behalf of the Ocean Conservancy. First, I would like to commend the work of the Task Force in putting together its interim report, and for providing the opportunity for stakeholders from around the country to provide comments. The Ocean Conservancy supports the efforts of the Task Force to develop a strong national ocean policy which uses marine spatial planning as a tool to achieve ecosystem-based management. Here in New England, the oceans have a long and storied past. From whaling, to shipping, to fishing, the ocean has always been an important natural and cultural resource here and elsewhere along our nation's coast. But this ocean which we often think of as wild and undeveloped has in recent decades become its newest frontier. For instance, in the face of climate change, the wind and the tides offer renewable energy, which promises positive impacts on our planet, including the oceans. However, the seascape has become increasingly complex as marine life, fishermen, recreationalists, and energy industries, mining operations, and ship traffic all attempt to co-exist. There is a clear need for guidance. It is time for a national ocean policy that can put into practice the concept of ecosystem-based management, taking into consideration both the human and the natural demands on the ocean in order to strike a balance between wise ocean use and ecosystem protection. Marine spatial planning is a valuable tool that can be used to achieve this holistic approach to management which brings together multiple ocean users to develop a comprehensive plan. Its results can reduce user conflicts and advance sustainable economic and social benefits while protecting ocean ecosystems. Fortunately, we're not starting from scratch in developing the principles of marine spatial planning. Great strides have been made overseas, as well as closer to home, both here in Rhode Island and in Massachusetts. We encourage the Task Force to use marine spatial planning as a tool as you move forward, and to draw important lessons from each of these examples. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments today, and thank you to all of you in the audience who have also provided valuable input on this important topic.

CHUCKIE GREEN: Good evening. I'm Chuckie Green from the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, I'm the natural resource assistant director and the historic preservation authority for the tribe. I'm here tonight because I wanted to comment on this process, and, like a lot of the processes that we've seen as tribes, the lack of communication, and our ability to participate. Those are very important to my tribe, we have, didn't get notice early in this process to come and be a part of the earlier process, which I've heard is already started, and going forward. We haven't gotten notice of the new towers that have been permitted that are going up, the

new test towers. All these things should be in our trust rights to know and to be aware of. And, how can we share with you our knowledge of what's out there. My other option is, my other, excuse me, my other comment is, this is a good plan, a good start, but why aren't we considering the things that are in federal waters that are happening right now. We've got a wind farm project that's going forward in our waters that is affecting the religious freedoms of my tribe, that should be bound by any rule or regulation that you folks decide to put because it is in federal waters. How do we get that back on the table. It's grandfathered now, they put up a test tower, and that gives them the authorization to go ahead and do whatever they please. The other point I want to make is, I heard it at the table, the science. The science hasn't been done in anything that I've seen in the ocean that we've done so far. We are so knee-jerk reacting to the situation that -- fossil fuels is the problem, elimination of fossil fuels is the solution. But, if we go and stick things into the waters, and change the currents, what is going to be the effect, how much of science, how much of the science has been done, and how much do you propose to put forward. Thank you.

WENDELL BROWN: Ma'am Chair, and Task Force members, thank you for the opportunity. My name is Wendell Brown, I'm at the School for Marine Science and Technology at the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth. I also sit on the board of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Association for Coastal Ocean Observing, MACOORA, and my comments are in support of that effort. MACOORA is a region that expands the coastal ocean from Cape Cod, Massachusetts to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. 66 million people are represented through 100 congressional districts in nine states that feature five major estuaries. MACOORA's observing system features an array of high-frequency radars, a fleet of autonomous ocean gliders, a satellite mapping facility, and, as well as some buoys. These data are used in the framework in an ensemble of models, provides new tools for the U.S. Coast Guard search and rescue, fisheries resources, ports authorization security, power company infrastructure repairs, storm flooding and wastewater management, as well as beach safety. In outlining my comments that have been submitted, we urge three main points. The first being a national policy that supports the continued implementation of a robust coastal ocean observing system. We believe that these systems are essential for implementing policy that is dealing with increased population growth. Second, we support a strong regional approach, which we believe is efficient and encourages stewardship, and is a necessary component for the long-term series necessary to deal with climate change. Lastly, we believe the national ocean policy framework must explicitly include ocean observations in the development of marine spatial planning. On behalf of MACOORA, thank you for this opportunity.

CHRISTIN REYNOLDS: Hi, thank you for listening and caring. My name is Christin Reynolds, and I'm an engineer and policy analyst with Applied Science Associates, an environmental consulting firm in South Kingstown, Rhode Island, and also an ocean lover, surfer, sunset watcher. And, regardless of the perspective, be it fisheries, conservation, industry, research and science, we all want a healthy ocean. It's important that we don't get lost in the process, but we do take action. Best practices are known, and solutions are available. Let us use this opportunity to

develop an ocean restoration budget, and use marine spatial planning, not just as a tool for citing anthropogenic uses, but as a tool to take the existing piecemeal of ocean management and transform it into a thoughtful plan to restore and sustain our oceans. Research and science funding is important, but what is equally important is communicating our knowledge to decision makers. We need to utilize public-private partnerships so that we can bridge the gap between policy and science, bringing the existing science tools and solutions to managers today. Thank you.

CARL PELLEGRINO: My name is Carl Pellegrino. A few minutes ago, you had heard from my wife who paddled about half of the U.S. coast in the name of establishing a sound ocean policy. That makes my biggest contribution probably minding the kids at home. But, as you know, the Pew Commission and the U.S. Commission completed their work about five years ago. Their findings were historic as is the consequence of inaction. Unfortunately, waiting for a crisis to occur has become the primary method of governing in developing policy. About 30 years ago, it took children dying in their parents' arms at Love Canal to simply make polluters responsible for cleaning up their toxic dumps. In 1984, it took hundreds of deaths from an accidental chemical release in Bhopal, India followed shortly by a near miss in West Virginia to get communities' right-to-know laws on the books. It took the Exxon Valdez oil spill to overhaul our nation's oil spill response platform, and also to provide the key to do so. It was a result of these that we now have local emergency planning committees where industry and local officials work together to develop local emergency action plans. In addition to this, in every coastal port, area committees bring together federal, state, and local governments, along with industry, environmental groups, academia, and others, to preplan oil spill response strategies, right down to specific human locations, and seasonal prediction priorities to target the presence and life stage of the species that are around. All this is done prior to an oil spill even taking place. All of this comes since work is being done because the federal government established the framework and structure to make it happen all across the country. All of this is based upon preventing a recurrence of a previous catastrophe, and as tragic as what occurred at Love Canal, Prince William Sound, and Bhopal were, they were only local catastrophes, the crisis which looms in our ocean has global consequences. Finding the remedy and the will to employ it will not be easy, especially related to turning back the tide against the consequences of ocean warming and ocean acidification. But, compared to that, establishing the basic framework for ocean management should be one of the simplest tasks ahead --
DAVID REYNOLDS: Please try to wrap it up.

CARL PELLEGRINO: Yes. A hundred years ago, we had a great president, Teddy Roosevelt, instilled a value in conserving our terrestrial and natural resources for future generations, establishing the National Park Service. Although we didn't have the scientific precision that we have today, he did what he knew was right. What we need today is another great president to make the same commitment to protect our oceans for future generations. And if this is not done through, through the result of your work, who else can make it happen. Thank you very much.

MASON WEINRICH: Thank you, my name is Mason Weinrich, I'm the executive director and chief scientist of the Whale Center New England in Gloucester, Massachusetts, a nonprofit that's been doing research, we've been down here for over 30 years, and has over 30 peer review publications on marine mammals and their ecosystems. First of all, thank you for all the hard work you're doing, and thank you for being here, thank you for the plan you've put together, the interim report is really right on. I'm sure you're really heading down the right directions, and we strongly support everybody else saying we need a strong, unified ocean management plan. However, in that, there are a couple of things in the interim report that I would like to comment on. The first is the goal because system-based management, which is essential, but ecosystem-based management is very difficult. There are many data gaps which should not stop us from using ecosystem-based management now, but do require proper funding, proper studies, and a proper plan to make sure that we can use that tool more efficiently, and I think Don Anderson did a great job of putting those steps forward, and I endorse everything that he says. Second of all, I was surprised to see that the plan does not address the one thing that we do have in place right now, which is the National Marine Sanctuaries Program, a highly underfunded program, and it would be great to see this plan delineate how it will work with the sanctuaries program and use that program to further the goals of the plan. In addition, I thought, in addition to the nine priority objectives you have, there should be another one, which is the recovery of endangered species. There are a number of marine species which need recovery. Those recovery actions, some recovery plans are in place that have to be taken into account when doing spatial planning. And, finally, I would encourage you to use marine mammals, especially large whales, as sentinels of the ecosystem. You can see these things, they have to come up to the surface, they are extremely large, they have large energetic requirements, they are great canaries in your coal mine, until you are aware there are important areas where there are problems, and where we need to pay some attention. We have many more comments we'll submit in writing. In a nutshell, thank you for being here, keep up the good work, we look forward to working with you. Thank you very much.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks. While the next speaker is coming up, would Kevin Essington, Ames Colt, Tim Dillingham, Robbin Peach, and Elizabeth Hernberg come up.

REGINA ASMUTIS-SILVIA: Hi, my name is Regina Asmutix-Silvia, I'm a senior biologist for the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, and I'm speaking on behalf of W.D.C.S., and their U.S. supporters this evening. I'd like to use the critically endangered North Atlantic right whale as an example for the need of effective and comprehensive ocean planning to prevent conflicts that can be harmful to the species. And I point out that the entire habitat for the entire species goes from Florida to the Gulf of Maine. There is currently fewer than 400 North Atlantic right whales remaining from a population that once exceeded 10,000. Initially, estimated by whaling, North Atlantic right whales now risk extinction from vessel strikes, entanglements in fishing gear, pollution, climate change, and habitat loss. According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, the loss of one right whale per year from human causes jeopardizes the

survival of the species, yet in less than a two-year period, at least 12 right whales were killed from anthropogenic causes. Risk to the species continue to escalate as proposals for offshore energy generation off the U.S. East Coast increase with sites off the coasts of Georgia, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Maine, and apparently Delaware was mentioned today, are now in consideration. The U.S. Navy's currentlyrequesting an undersea warfare training site off of Jacksonville, Florida just east of the only known calving area for the species. And near coastal shipping proposals are being considered along the entire East Coast. As a result, on September 15th of this year, W.D.C.S., along with the Center for Biological Diversity, Humane Society of the United States, Ocean Conservancy, and Defenders of Wildlife, petitioned the Secretary of Commerce increase critical habitat for the species. Our petition encourages more appropriate protections for this species in its most-needed areas, requests an effective use and enforcement of existing laws, including the Endangered Species Act. For right whales, as well as other whales, water fowl, migratory passerines, fish, and turtles, it's critical to do more forward thinking, and consider cumulative impacts to species and habitats rather than proceeding from site-specific development, only to regret it later. The promise made by President Obama to return to science-based management, and act as a steward for the ocean has to be kept. I've also submitted these comments, and I've also submitted the petition for critical habitat. Thank you.

KEVIN ESSINGTON: Good evening. Ma'am Chair, Task Force, thanks for having us. My name is Kevin Essington with the Nature Conservancy, here in Rhode Island. You heard from Janet Coit, she got to go first, she's my boss. I just want to make a quick point about the, another key issue that the Nature Conservancy would urge you to consider in your final recommendation, that we're thrilled to see is in your interim report, is about coastal resilience in the face of climate change. The Conservancy believes that protecting and enhancing the resilience of our coastal systems in the face of climate change is one of the greatest challenges we face in ensuring long-term ecological and economic viability of our coasts. Nature Conservancy's work on the Albemarle Peninsula in North Carolina has shown that with good data, and active community engagement, it is possible to plan for a rapidly changing coastal world. We endorse using living shorelines that buffer impacts from storms. These are done at a fraction of the cost of otherwise very destructive and engineered solutions. So, we encourage you to promote funding to assist the thousands of coastal communities along our coasts, here on the Atlantic and elsewhere, to plan for these kinds of rapid changes. Thank you very much.

AMES BORDEN COLT: Good evening, Ma'am Chair, and Task Force members. My name is Ames Borden Colt, I'm the chair of the Rhode Island Bays, Rivers, and Watersheds Coordination Team, and on behalf of Governor Carcieri, and the rest of his administration, welcome to Rhode Island. The Coordination Team is a state interagency commission whose mission is to promote interagency coordination, and collaborative learning, advanced ecosystem-based management of marine, estuarine, and fresh water resources, and foster development of Rhode Island's water-reliant economy. The

Coordination Team pursues its mission through implementation and evaluation of the Rhode Island bays, rivers, and watersheds systems-level plan, which is organized into eight sections, waterfront and coastal development, watersheds, water-reliant economy, natural hazards, fresh water supply, water quality, fisheries and aquaculture, aquatic habitats, and invasive species. The purpose of developing a single, strategic plan or policy framework that covers such a diverse suite of issues and challenges is to work towards a system-based approach to coordinating and enhancing the activities of seven key Rhode Island executive agencies responsible for our waters and watersheds, agencies who share similar mission and values, but who possess distinct authorities, skill sets, capacities, cultures, and history. The Coordination Team through four standing committees works closely with federal and local agencies, NGOs, educators, and researchers. This is a relatively new approach to executive agency coordination and strategic planning for Rhode Island. In crafting the state law we function under, Representative Eileen Naughton and Dr. Sandra Whitehouse modeled the coordination team explicitly on the Puget Sound action team, now known as the Puget Sound Partnership. The Coordination Team also resembles in purpose and institutional design the New York Ocean and Great Lakes Ecosystem Conservation Council, and the California Ocean Protection Council. We're a little different from these councils in that we also possess an explicit mandate to integrate economic development and environmental values. Hence, our strategic plan's emphasis upon coastal and waterfront development in our marine and freshwater-based economic sectors. Comparative analysis of these four state integrative planning and executive coordination initiatives will help other states and federal agencies develop their own coordination frameworks. Interagency and intergovernmental coordination requires --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Try to wrap it up, please.

AMES BORDEN COLT: ...time, effort, and strong patience in executive and political leadership. Thank you very much.

TIM DILLINGHAM: Good evening, Ma'am Chairwoman, and members of the Task Force. My name is Tim Dillingham, I'm the executive director the American Littoral Society, we're a membership-based coastal conservation association headquartered in Sandy Hook, in New Jersey. We have offices in New York, as well as in Florida, and Pennsylvania. We do a lot of different types of things, we educate kids, thousands of kids come through our offices every year. We fund and conduct oyster and habitat restoration in Jamaica Bay, the Delaware Bay, Barnegat, the Hudson River Estuary. We coordinate the marine debris cleanups every year in the State of New York, and we run a citizens recreational fisherman's tagging program that has over 1,500 folks that are looking to fish, collecting information, which we then pass on to the researchers. We're very much on the ground, and facing the issues. I want to commend you all for the work you've done. We very much need a comprehensive national ocean policy. And we would urge you to move that recommendation forward to the President. We read through the report, it is clear to us that a national policy will strengthen the nation's ability to face the issues, or to deal with the issues that are facing the oceans and the coastal waters you heard so much about tonight, and we very much endorse the principles that

you outline in the report as a basis for the tools of the government, and the public, and the nation needs to put into place to both restore and revitalize our oceans. I want to stress two things I thought were very strong in the interim report, and that is the recognition of the need to protect the land, to protect the sea. All our estuaries are clearly under stress due to land development, and that is one area we clearly have not done enough work on. And, secondly, is the priortization and the recognition of habitat restoration. We have unfortunately not been good stewards throughout the years. We've lost many of the resources. In order to have the sustainable ecosystems that we've talked about tonight, we need to restore that resource base, and bring those areas back. So, we thank you very much for your work, and we look forward to seeing this as it moves forward.

ROBBIN PEACH: Good evening. Mark Twain once said, "Never learn to do anything. If you don't learn, you will always be able to find somebody else to do it for you." So, I'm sure with all the late nights and hard work you've put into this, you may have wished that you had taken Mark Twain's advice, but when you really think about it, you've got an incredible opportunity here, not only to create an edict in the nation, but, by association, internationally. And, I really want to congratulate you on the interim report. I read it front to cover -- cover to end, and I think you've done a fabulous job. You also have the excellent assistance of everybody in this room, and the process by which you've engaged the stakeholders is very commendable. My name is Robbin Peach, and I am a senior research fellow at the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies at UMass Boston, and it's UMass Boston where the Massachusetts Ocean Partnership that you heard about earlier is housed, and I'm a co-principal investigator with the Dean. And we have seen, through the work, the wonderful work that the State of Massachusetts has done, and the help of the Mass. Ocean Partnership, what it takes to create an ecosystem-based, spatially-explicit marine ocean plan. And the extensive data, good science, observation systems, decision support tools, and stakeholder involvement opportunities need resources, and there are scarce resources in these economic times. States, I think, can do a very good job of, relatively inexpensively, of creating a framework for marine spatial planning. But, to do real, integrated, ecosystem-based planning that needs to be monitored and constantly adopted, and adapted over years will take resources. So, I guess, the good work that Massachusetts is doing, the work that's being done in Rhode Island, the work that's done in Maine, and other New England states, really is something that is a model for the rest of the nation. But, I guess the haiku that I would give you is, Expert panel on financing, beyond the opportunities for internal -- I have that red light already, but I will submit comments on alternative financing, and creative financing techniques. And I'd also be remiss if I didn't applaud you for really underscoring the need for education for the next year's, and the next decade's generation of students who will soon be making all of the decisions that you're now making. Thank you.
DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. And while the next speaker is coming up, I want to call Billy Pellegrino, Bruce Stedman, Cindy Ziff, John Bullard, and Patrick Barosh.

ELIZABETH HERNBERG: I told them -- I'm told I'm number 35, so I guess we're halfway through this. My name is Elizabeth Hernberg, and I'm with Sprague Energy Corp. Sprague is an energy supplier based in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and we serve the New England market with a variety of distillates, residual fuels, biofuels, and other petroleum products. We own and operate nearly 8 million barrels of petroleum storage in 17 terminals on the East Coast for direct and indirect supply of home heating oil that serves the homes, commercial, and industrial uses. My main message today relates to the lifeline that the water provides Sprague, not only for Providence, but also for the rest of our terminal network. As you know, this region lacks refining capacity, as well as pipelines. Therefore, the only avenue for supply is either over land, or by sea. The vast majority of our product comes by vessel, as is the case with most of our regional industry. So, in Providence, we're fortunate to have the natural asset on the waterfront that has a very deep draft, and this has been preserved as the Army Corps of Engineers invested tens of millions of dollars to dredge this area, roughly, about five years ago. Sprague alone spent millions more to dredge our berth, which provided us roughly 35/37 feet of draft. So, in your discussions on the ocean policy, please keep this unique feature of New England and Providence in mind, and its heavy reliance on ocean vessels to serve this region's petroleum demand. Thank you.

BRUCE STEDMAN: Good evening, I'm Bruce Stedman, the executive director of the Marine Fish Conservation Network. It's a coalition of 200 environmental conservation-minded fishing groups, aquariums, and marine science organizations. We're sincerely appreciative of the work that you've done, and the considerable thinking that went into the interim national ocean policy report, and we're very impressed, especially, with the level of detail that you were able to accomplish given the time available. We especially commend the overarching theme of stewardship of our ocean, coasts, and Great Lakes. And we strongly encourage you to maintain that theme in the marine spatial planning phase of your work. Our member groups are currently studying in detail and discussing MSP options, and providing, writing some suggestions to you, but in advance of that, a few suggestions. One is to try to seek to design a system that takes into account local and state information. But, at the same time, maintains the actual cross-jurisdictional ecosystem way of thinking about these problems. We want, we suggest you emphasize comprehensive, integrative planning, but don't allow the MSP framework to assume, necessarily, that everything that's suggested has to be put somewhere just because there's a marine spatial planning process. It should retain the capacity to say no to things that are genuinely harmful to ecosystems. We think you should emphasize the link between coastal and marine planning to protect estuaries, link, especially, add temporal considerations to the spatial planning work that you're doing, emphasize habitat protection, of course; and, finally, include adaptive management that can account for the impacts of climate change that we all know are increasing. These are all, all of these issues are of great concern to our members, and we thank you for your work, especially, and for the opportunity to speak this evening. Thank you.

CINDY ZIFF: Perhaps it's not such a stretch to hear the rock and roll in the background because that's exactly what we want you to do is to rock and roll. My name is Cindy Ziff, and I'm the executive director of Clean Ocean Action. I came up from New Jersey on mass transit to be with you today, and to applaud your efforts. I'm a community organizer for the ocean, and have been for 25 years. And, so, I have to believe in the audacity of hope because it's the only thing that's really been driving our campaigns and our efforts over the years. And so, we welcome with such, with such deep appreciation the ocean challenge that President Obama has laid out before you, and are so thrilled with the leadership of the committee to get the job done. I've been organizing 125 organizations for 25 years to try to clean up and protect the waters off the New York and New Jersey coasts, which, at the time we were founded was the ocean dumping capital of the world, and we're also downstream of the most densely populated urbanized area of the country. These 125 organizations range from religious groups, garden clubs, civic organizations, commercial and recreational fishermen, that on land would be like herding cats, but, on the ocean issues, they school like fish. And that's because they're all dedicated to a clean and healthy ocean. And, with tenacity and a clear mission, we worked together and ended ocean dumping, and have brought that ocean back on, off the Jersey shore, New York and New Jersey coast, to a very viable and happier marine environment. I just want to emphasize one point, and it has to do with carpe diem. You have this incredible opportunity, you have this great report, and I would just urge you to be very strong in your plan, because, for example, the principles are set out as shoulds, and they really should be shalls, because, you know, we have this austere and wonderful group that's leading this challenge, but Darth Vadar may follow. And, so, it's very imperative that you create a strong ocean policy that will not allow rollbacks, and not allow loopholes. Thank you very much.

JOHN BULLARD: Members of the Task Force, I am not Darth Vadar. I'm John Bullard, I'm president of Sea Education Association in Woods Hole, and I want to talk about the objectives and goals you have an increasing understanding through education. This is what, these are worthwhiles, what Sea Education Association has done since 1971. We offer high school, college, and graduate students an opportunity to learn about the ocean, and the history of human interaction with the ocean in a classroom setting. In Woods Hole, their students design a research experiment to carry out at sea, and then SEA does what no one else does, and that is to take these prepared students out on the open ocean, in a safe sailing research vessel, for a long enough time to learn about the ocean and its many dimensions, scientific, historical, physical, and emotional. Our vessels, sailing school vessels, Westward, Corwith Cramer, and Robert C. Seamans, have taken over 8,000 students on passages totaling over one million miles. Many of our alumni now populate the labs and offices that wrestle with the issues that are the subject of your report. So, we're doing what you say needs to be done. And, I think we're the only organization who takes students for academic credit on extended sea voyages to learn about the ocean in an interdisciplinary way. And, what I want to tell you is that this is hard, and we could use your support if you think it's a worthwhile mission. It's hard for several reasons. As your report has noted, most people are not aware of the ocean. It doesn't

occur to most students that the ocean might be a place for off-campus study. Secondly, science is a big part of our program, and for reasons elaborated, for reasons elaborated in your report, yet, many students who are not science majors are intimidated by science, and science majors, themselves, have a hard time studying off campus. We have shown over 38 years we can make science accessible to capable students of all interests, but many are reluctant to try it first. Taking students safely out to sea requires ships, and ships are expensive classrooms --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap up your comments.

JOHN BULLARD: As a private nonprofit with very modest endowment, that means we must charge a tuition that seems out of reach, so, if it's a worthwhile mission, we could use your support to make it accessible to more students who will increase understanding of the ocean. Thank you very much.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks. I'd like to call up Tricia Vedele; Andrea Parker, or Audra Parker; Paul Costabile; Aaron Dority; Bonnie Spinazzola. And I'd just like to say, you're doing a great job keeping on time. So, if we do that, we can get everybody in. Okay. Who is up now? Is this --

BILLY PELLEGRINO: Hi, my name is Billy.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Okay.

BILLY PELLEGRINO: I'm seven years old. I don't want to see the oceans go. They're polluted, there's run-off, dirty litter is coming into our oceans. It's not good. We don't want it to be there. We need to help it stop. Thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

TRICIA VEDELE: That's a tough act to follow. My name is Tricia Vedele, I'm the vice president of Conservation Law Foundation, and the director of the Rhode Island Advocacy Center. Conservation Law Foundation supports and applauds the Task Force and the President in this effort.

I just want to point out, and someone touched on this before me, that, in the Tier 1 functions that you have set up for the National Oceans Council, one of the responsibilities is that the Council review and provide annual direction for national policy objectives based on administration priorities. And, obviously, administration priorities change over time. I think it would, it would be great if the Task Force could consider, especially in light of the language throughout the interim report, language like balancing, effectively balancing, competing, and complimentary uses, terminology like, wherever practicable, consideration of environmental costs. It's important to understand that it's difficult to quantify costs associated with ecosystem damage and loss. And, as litigators, we've seen that throughout the years. So, as you think about the terminology that you use in your final report, I hope that you'll consider a pre-established framework that affords appropriate weight to non-use values, and ecosystem values that otherwise might be difficult to

monetize if cost is going to be one of the factors. And, I'll also just, because Mount Hope Bay has to be talked about again, that it's, this is not just an issue where the State of Rhode Island got a permit that was based on state water quality standards, and then FERC issued a preliminary finding. It's also an issue where the Army Corps of Engineers said that the state's water quality standards could be ignored in allowing 70 acres of winter flounder habitat to be dredged. And the U.S. Coast Guard issues a letter of recommendation saying that the lanes are suitable for transportation. Federal coordination is a big issue, and Mount Hope Bay is a great area for you to look at as an example of where that's not happening. Thank you.

AUDRA PARKER: Hi, my name is Audra Parker, and I'm the executive director of the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this much needed national ocean plan. The Alliance is a nonprofit environmental group dedicated to the long-term preservation of Nantucket Sound, the unique body of water between Cape Cod, Nantucket, and Martha's Vineyard. Since our inception in 2002, we have been calling for the establishment of a national ocean policy based on spatial planning to balance the protection of coastal resources with competing development interests. There are numerous offshore projects being proposed along the East Coast, which must all be made subject to ocean zoning if we are truly committed to responsible stewardship of our waters. The ocean zoning process needs to encompass all coastal and ocean resources, and needs to be completed prior to permitting any specific projects like Cape Wind, the industrial-scale wind project proposed for Nantucket Sound. Nantucket Sound is one of the most valuable marine ecosystems in the United States. It has a rich ecological heritage and is an important habitat for birds, fish, and other wildlife. The communities in the area have relied for generations on the Sound for its natural resources, and its role as the region's economic engine. The sound has long supported a fishing community, and Native American tribes that, in turn, have helped define the historic and cultural landscape and rich maritime heritage, a key preservation objective of the national policy. The area's tribes consider this Sound to be sacred land with deep religious and cultural significance. Because of these characteristics, the Sound has long been under consideration for protected status. In 1971, its state waters were designated sanctuary under state law, and in 1980, it was nominated for national marine sanctuary status. These state and federal efforts illustrate the importance of the Sound to the region, and its significance nationally as a historically noteworthy water body. The Cape Wind project would pose significant economic, environmental, and cultural harm, as well as risk public safety. If it is allowed to move forward without the benefit of spatial planning, it would destroy the intrinsic values of the Sound, as well as the goals of the ocean planning process. If the Cape Wind, however, if the Cape Wind review is suspended until spatial planning is complete, a consensus-based alternative could be found in an area designated for development, and consistent with the ocean plan. Cape Wind could then proceed in a better location without controversy, without the adverse impacts it would create in the Sound, and without future litigation. We respectfully request that the national ocean plan include Nantucket Sound, and that M.M.S. be directed to suspend its review of Cape Wind until this critical ocean planning process is complete. Thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: And, let me, before you start, first of all, can I have your name?

AARON DORITY: My name is Aaron Dority.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Aaron, okay. So, I just want to call up Bonnie Spinazzola, I think I called you before, William Nuckols, Angela Sanfilippo, David Dow, Jim Hain, and Dennis Duffy. Thank you.

AARON DORITY: Members of the Task Force, good evening. My name is Aaron Dority, I work for Penobscot East Resource Center in Stonington, Maine. And, Penobscot East works to secure future for fishing communities in eastern Maine. Stonington consistently ranks among the highest revenue ports in the nation for one reason, lobster. Penobscot East is in Stonington. Traditionally, the fishermen in this region have caught scallops, herring, groundfish, shrimp, and quahogs, in addition to lobster. Today, the lack of fisheries diversity is striking. There's only one fishery left, and the ecosystem is so substantially altered from a healthy state that many younger fishermen have never seen a haddock in the waters where they fish. Historical accounts show that haddock formerly existed in staggering abundance in this region. Part of the problem is that management currently offers little protection for the habitat on the coastal shelf in the Northeast, and no recognition of the fine-scale structure of populations of fish. Ecosystem management is an excellent idea, and it's part of the solution. Many scientists and managers are working on incorporating ecosystem management, and we encourage this development. We concur with panelist Don Anderson's view that ecosystem management needs to incorporate the fine-scale nature of fish populations. And, furthermore, we believe that appropriate ecosystem management must involve fishermen, and their communities. For far too long, many have approached fisheries' problems by eliminating fishermen from the fishery. Instead, managers should place limits on the scale of fishing activity, and should strongly preserve the involvement of community-based fisherman. To ensure proper stewardship, we need to reverse the long-term loss of access for those fishermen, who may provide the stewardship within the framework of appropriate fisheries' management, including a focus on biological scale. Thank you.

WILLIAM NUCKOLS: Good evening. My name is William Nuckols, I'm the principal of W.H. Nuckols Consulting, and my comments tonight are based on 20 years of marine science experience, as well as public policy experience in Washington, D.C., that spans the last three administrations. Particularly, in these challenging economic times, a policy that I believe should be explicitly stated when the President releases his national policy would be the following quote, "When addressing coastal and ocean issues in my administration, I will plan for, and execute, an unprecedented level of efficiency as the federal government delivers sustainable resources, safety, and national security of the American people." Efficiency needs to be the hallmark of a change in attitudes and practices in the federal government. When the Ocean Policy Task Force report briefly mentions encouraging efficiencies on Page 17, as the next to last bullet of the policy section, I argue that this is woefully

insufficient given the state of our national economy. One area for improvement in efficiencies is the federal budgeting process. A few years ago, the ocean community mulled over the options for significantly restructuring the federal agency and Congressional committee responsibilities, or choosing to leave them in place, and leaving the often-cited complex and unwielding collection of statutes and authorities in place, and we went with the second option. The political realities of moving forward with a holistic restructuring because impractical, and people moved towards the idea of providing an approved road map for coordination and collaboration. In the field of rational budget planning, we appeared to have made little progress, however. Given the realities of the Hill's authorization and appropriation committee structures, the improvements, the options for improvements in a rational deficiency-based planning were really best accomplished by the executive branch, who can then provide Congress with topic, or theme-based budget proposals that clearly indicate how both the President's new priorities, as well as the federal statutory responsibilities that Congress has given us are addressed by the agency budgets. And I'm speaking about something that is much more robust than the budget presentation that is currently occurring, resulting from the Oceans Act of 2000. That is, but at its best speed, even if we go down this road, the delay in budget granting process will result in an impact in terms of what's actually happening in the agencies, at best, speed, in 2011, more realistically, 2012. So, this means that more than half of the President’s term is going to be based on trying to execute a collection --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap it up.

WILLIAM NUCKOLS ...of budget lines that are not optimized at all, to align with his overarching policy. We're going to need a robust coordination process that actually works with this budget reality. And when I mean robust, I'm talking about something at a scale that has not been tried before, either at the national or regional process. We've been doing this for too many years, and found out that a small investment in this coordination results, really, in no improvement in efficiencies, and actually probably is a step backwards as we waste that staffing time. Thank you.

ANGELA SANFILIPPO: Good evening. My name is Angela Sanfilippo, I'm the president of the Gloucester Fishermen's Wives Association, and the executive director of the Massachusetts Fisherman Partnership. I want to really say to you, welcome. We've been waiting for you for 33 years. The Gloucester Fishermen's Wives came about in 1969 because these wives of fishermen saw that the ocean was in trouble, and needed help. We needed to get rid of factory trolls. And, so, they started to lobby for it. It took them seven years. In 1977, when they finally got that, two months later, oil drilling became an issue on Georges Bank, so, another battle. Then was ocean dumping that we had to stop because it was polluting all our waters, another battle with too many government agencies. Through the desperation of saving Stellwagen Bank, we asked Congress to approve Stellwagen Bank Marine Sanctuary because it was going to go with (inaudible) Island, and everything else in between. So, I am really open to what you're trying to do. We have worked very hard to protect our

ocean. We've gone all over the world to help small communities learn how to protect the oceans. And when people look at us, they think we just want it for us because we represent commercial fishermen. We know that if we don't have a healthy ocean, there is no fish. It isn't only the fishermen that damage the ocean, it's everything else that happens. We work through these years with a lot of government agencies, but it's very difficult. The Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Navy, the Coast Guard, all the regulatory, it's impossible to protect the ocean when you have to deal with so many people. So, we really hope that you do your work, and we really want to thank President Obama. As I remember, back in 1997, when we got together, at the Ocean Conference in Monterey, this is what we asked for. So, thank you. At the end, I only want to say one thing, I hope, God, that this is not the work, so, at the end, we can take the ocean away from the people that use it for 400 years to give it to others. Our first resource of the ocean is the fish. It's the food of the world. Protect it, but don't take it away for the people who have done it for 400 years. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

DAVID DOW: My name is David Dow, I'm a grass roots environmental activist from Cape Cod. My view on the Ocean Policy Task Force is from the bottom-up perspective. First thing I was going to mention is that the Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan offers an opportunity for Cape Cod to become carbon neutral by constructing ten small-scale committee wind farms, and two or three large-scale ones. Under the Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan, large-scale wind farms would be primarily in federal waters. I want to make two points. The state and federal government need to develop an operational definition of sustainable fisheries in order to protect essential fish habitat, while promoting the development of large-scale renewable energy projects in our federal waters. Cape Cod waters provide critical habitat for North Atlantic right Whales, and habitat areas of particular concern for fisheries, so the environmental protection is important, as well. The second point, the interim ocean policy report does not adequately address how the federal, state, and local coordination will occur to make best use of ocean space, and resolve these conflicts. We need a statement of desired outcomes, a plan for how we will get there, and identification of the government entities responsible for making this plan a reality. Thanks.

JIM HAIN: I'm Jim Hain, I am the senior scientist at Associated Scientists at Woods Hole, and I'm the editor of Right Whale News. The language in the report is encouraging. However, I note that it's somewhat broadbrush, as these things often are, and I request that the Task Force consider the idea of a specific project that would serve as an anchor, or a demonstration of the concepts that you're advocating, and that is the conservation and recovery of the North Atlantic right whale. And, in that topic is all the dimensions, and all the factors that this Task Force is likely to address. The advantages that, by identifying a specific project, and, in fact, there were several mentioned today, that, it's a project that you can get a handle on. The, several points regarding that, using that as a, as an example. The impression that one gets from reading the report is that it's governmentcentric, and I just make note of the fact that a great deal of the expertise and history in right whale conservation science and recovery is external to the government. The next

point I'd like to make is that the report speaks of interagency coordination, and this is where, in my opinion, there's a fatal flaw in the program. And that is that, and I'm saying this fairly carefully, on some days, and on some issues, the, at least one agency that I'm familiar with, has accountability transparency funding and permitting issues. And, if one is interested in interagency coordination, then the, these sorts of within-agency issues need to be addressed, else the efforts will be undermined. And, if it sounds like I'm being impolite, if you agree, as the report states, that the time to act is now, then it's okay to be less polite, and to get the issues on the table.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap it up now.

JIM HAIN: And, in conclusion, I, and I'm sure many other folks, are happy to work with you on this.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks, and I'll call up Marcia Hart, Katie Zimmerman, Barry Schiller, Polly Bradley, and Neil Good.

DENNIS DUFFY: My name is Dennis Duffy, I'm with Cape Wind Associates, America's first offshore wind proposal, which has now been under intensive regulatory review for almost nine years. So, we're very happy the Task Force is moving forward. We're actively engaged with a number of the ocean-based NGO groups, and I think, just the fact that a project could be under intense review for nine years in itself speaks to the fact that we've really got to make some changes, and come up with some more coordinated and streamlined policies. Just, by way of background, we have achieved a, received a very favorable final environmental impact statement from the M.M.S. just this January, which has really allowed the project to move forward with a lot of public support. It's got, independent polling is showing 86 percent support among Massachusetts voters, which is unheard of for a major energy project, as well as the support of all the, the major environmental NGOs, as well as organized labors. It's one of the rare opportunities where you see the convergence of green environment with green job interest, which has also got us the strong support of the Massachusetts governor, as well as the legislative leadership in Massachusetts. I'm also a member of the AWEA's Offshore Wind Working Group, which Peter Mandelstam chairs, and, as a general matter, I'd like to concur with everything he said. I mean, we're on the same page, and we're really working those same policy agendas. I'd like to stress just three particular points in addition to Peter's. First, would be to give due deference to state ocean and energy policies where they have been carefully developed. Secondly, to avoid unintended delays in progressive policies that are already underway. And, thirdly, to place a greater emphasis on the final reports in climate change issues, and climate change mitigation. Now, one good example that applies to all three of these points is the recent New England Governors' Blueprint on Energy. All six New England states have come up with a common plan, a very strong emphasis on offshore wind as part of the solution. They want to move forward. The New England states are all together on this one, and we urge the federal government to facilitate that process. We'll be putting in written comments, and I thank you.

PAULINE CANTWELL: Hello, I want to thank you for having us here to make comments this afternoon. I'm Pauline Cantwell from Greenwich, Connecticut. And, I'm here today, I have worked on peace issues at the U.N. since '94, trying to bring the military issues to the table of environment issues, the climate change issues. It's the elephant in the white room that can't be talked about. Today, I want to talk about four issues. And, I'll tell you that I do have packets here, if anybody wants some, and copies of this statement. I'm concerned about in our issues, the experimental weather modification programs that are ongoing, over 66 are listed by NOAA. Some are huge, none east of the Mississippi, for some reason, they don't list the ones east of the Mississippi. And, then, the manmade clouds that are exacerbating global warming, and changing our climate. One of the big mitigation programs from climate change is to create a cloud cover to bounce back the sun and offset global warming. However, NASA notes that the artificial clouds created by jet contrails are trapping the heat, exacerbating global warming. Then, the other two issues are the five-year Navy, Air Force warfare weapons' program that says they will take 32 marine mammals, this color flier tells all about it. The map on the back tells where it will be, it will virtually encircle our United States. Our coastal waters will be taken over by the military to do bombing, using toxic chemicals. Everything else we talk about is moot if we don't stop this program. And, then, the U.S. Navy atmospheric testing that took place this weekend. They sent up a rocket to create a manmade cloud that they're going to be watching, that project is called CARE, C-A-R-E, the acronym. Thank you.

POLLY BRADLEY: I'm Polly Bradley, and I'm representing Safer Waters In Massachusetts, or SWIM, a small environmental all-volunteer group based in Nahant, the smallest town in Massachusetts, we're a peninsula, but when there's a big storm, we're an island. And, under global warming, we may again become fully an island. So, we've been watching these ocean problems for a long, long time. And we've also been involved with the Massachusetts Ocean Plan as observers, and going to meetings and so forth. And I just wanted to point out a couple of pitfalls that you may come to. Make sure that you keep your focus very strongly on restoring the marine ecosystem; be sure to protect biodiversity; and keep the shore birds in mind, they're in danger everywhere in the fisheries. This, your interim report, is very good, but now you're going into the next phase, the spatial planning. That's where you make these wonderful maps, and the maps are just fascinating, and so good, but that is the point at which you are likely to lose your focus on your real purpose, which is restoring marine biodiversity, and protecting the oceans. I was fascinated by the man who mentioned that this was

152

a, this was not an offshore land rush. And, actually, I grew up in Oklahoma, I'm the daughter of pioneers, and, yes, it is sort of a land run, it's just like the Oklahoma Rush. It's been going on a while, and it's going to continue if you don't watch out. So, keep in mind, keep in sharp focus that you're there to protect the ocean, not to just use it up.

KATIE ZIMMERMAN: Hi. I'm Katie Zimmerman, I came all the way up today from Charleston, South Carolina. So, it was a good flight. I'm here to represent the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, we're an

environmental nonprofit, and we have about 4,000 members. And, we have a lot of similar issues to what New England is facing. If you all have ever been to Charleston, it's very similar to Newport, only different accents, and different politicians making national news. And, the things that we're very concerned about are, stormwater run-off is a biggy because we rely very much on our wetlands, especially, we were celebrating the anniversary of Hurricane Hugo, not celebrating, remembering the anniversary of Hurricane Hugo that happened 20 years ago. We want to make sure we keep our wetlands clean and intact so that they can protect us from whatever is coming up next. We're very concerned about the warming temperatures, climate change, inundation, currently Charlestonians, people in the low counry have waterfront property, but, pretty soon, the middle of the state might end up being the waterfront property, so, we're concerned about that. Our biggest source of income in the state of South Carolina is tourism, which means fishing, which means all that comes from the fishing, and Carnival Cruises coming in through, and we want to make sure that we keep our fisheries sustainable. We're very concerned about mercury levels, as well. But, the biggest issue for us at the moment is our port system. We have one of the biggest ports in the country in the South Carolina State Ports Authority, and we want to make sure that, in this report, you continue to look at the shipping industry, and the effects that it has on air pollution, water pollution, running into right whales, not paying attention to right whales. We need the port, it's very vital to the economy, but we also need to make sure that that's something that's balanced with community health, and community concerns, and environmental health. Thank you very much.

BARRY SCHILLER: I'm Barry Schiller, a citizen here in the Ocean State. I enjoy living here. I'm a rank-and-file member of several environmental groups who have convinced me our oceans are under stress. You've got a lot of good ideas, of course, and who could be against coordination and eco-based management, and more funding, and scientific research. But, I want to point out four tough areas that I hope you'll call attention to, and, that I think we need to think about in terms of saving the oceans in the long run. And, I don't expect you to be the leaders on these issues, but I hope you call attention to help those who are working on it. First of all, is the plastics and related throwaway industry that is littering the ocean. Sierra Corps (phonetic), one of my groups, has a long story, called Message in a Bottle, and it begins with, "Sea birds are starving with bellies full of trash..." and it goes on from there. You've got to help us take on the throwaway industry, the plastic industry, the litter industry, that, frankly, in Rhode Island, we're having a hard time improving the legislation, but maybe ocean people can help us. That was one. Number 2 is about energy. You've heard a lot about it. I think you need to take on, frankly, the fossil fuel industry. It's not just global climate, it's transport of oil. And, remember, when the gas prices spiked up, it was drill, baby, drill. In my opinion, the prices will spike up again sooner or later, and we'll be back to that. To protect the oceans, we have to have alternatives to fossil fuels, and we have to be able to say no to them. They're very powerful. Ocean people have to be willing to step up. Number 3 is, simply, human population growth. The world is still growing at 80 million people a year, the U.S., about 3 million people a year. A lot of them want to live on the coast, that means more

development, more runoff, more conflict with the multiple users, more marinas, more shipping, more recreational boaters, more of everything. That's a recipe for disaster. The 4th has to do with world peace. I don't expect you to make it your primary issue, but if we have wars and preparation for wars, that's going to hurt the oceans. Do your best to head that off.

DAVID REYNOLDS: And, I'd like to call up Bill Mott, Brian Loftes, Gib Chase, and Lisa Pires.

MARCIA HART: I'm Marcia Hart. I'm from Gloucester, Mass. I'm a nurse by profession. I tried to write a haiku, but I couldn't remember how to do it, and I'm always wordy. Fishermen, the heroic dead on my city hall wall, community created by losses at sea, 200 men down in a storm, leaving scores of widows and fatherless children. The nation's most dangerous job still today. Heroic spirit now morphed into over fishers of the sea, watch out, they will try to take the last fish. We will be left a legacy of jellyfish filling our ocean. These fishers, they are the ones who are raping and plundering the waters, much more like Black Bart than Spencer Tracy, or John Barrymore in Captain's Courageous. I agree with the swimmer who was up here before talking about how obvious it is that we are a connected world, and are islands in this connected water, and we certainly need to protect it. I think that I could coexist with all the people who got up, and the issues that have been brought up here today, and that we could find common ground enough to have the needs and the constituencies all represented under an ocean plan. But, I think the plan is only going to be as good as the completeness of the scientific data that is used, and the unbiasness of it. And, also, of the ability of the people who are appointed after this Task Force who are the ones who will be making the decisions on the federal level. I'm afraid more, not of the fishermen of being Black Bart, but I think there are Black Barts out there, real pirates and plunderers. I think our economic system has shown that in the last year, I work in health care, it's a problem there, too. I don't want to see consolidation of industries, it's much more wonderful to have small boats going out and bringing back the resources to a community --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap up your comments now.

MARCIA HART: Thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks.

NEIL GOOD: My name is Neil Good, I live in Mashpee on Cape Cod. We heard a little bit about the promise of wind power earlier today. I would like to present a small part of the other side of the coin, if I may be so bold. This is an excerpt from a news story in Monday's edition of Copenhagen Post, one of the largest newspapers in Denmark, that European country we are constantly told must be followed in promoting and expanding wind power. The headline is, "Dog Fight Over Wind Power Subsidies." And the leading paragraph starts, "The governing liberal party wants to cut state funding for land-based wind turbines in favor of financing biogas hydrogen solar cell development. The government's ally,

the Danish People's Party welcome the proposal, pointing out that wind subsidies have cost residents and electric companies billions. Party group chairman, Kristian Dahl, said that customers had paid huge additional charges on their electrical bills for almost three decades based on an ideological desire to promote the development of wind turbines." I'd like to ask that all government agencies show more objectivity and far less enthusiasm when considering placing wind turbines off our coastline. Please do not let ideology overtake common sense. It's appalling to me that a huge wind power plant might be allowed in the center of Nantucket Sound, which links Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket Sound into one region that is without a doubt a truly special area of North America. In closing, I'd like to say that just a few months ago I was driving through a small town in Maine, and saw a sign saying simply, "Preservation is progress." I wholeheartedly agree, and I trust you do, too. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

BILL MOTT: Thank you for the opportunity to speak, and thank you for taking the time to come to Providence. I hope you've had a nice big lunch because this is going a little bit late into the dinner hour. My name is Bill Mott, I'm director of the Ocean Project based here in Providence, but we work nationally and internationally in partnership to advance ocean conservation with aquariums, zoos, and museums. All the research points to the fact that our ocean is in deep trouble, and that we depend on a healthy ocean to survive and thrive. Yet, Americans know more about casino gambling and video games than about the ocean. A comprehensive new national public opinion survey commissioned by the Ocean Project in collaboration with the Monterey Bay Aquarium and the National Aquarium in Baltimore, and largely funded by a grant from the Environmental Literacy Grant Program, and NOAA, reveals that our knowledge about, and concern for the environment is limited, and lags far behind other major issues. The ocean is barely on the radar, and Americans are unaware of the connection between climate change and ocean health. This survey is the largest ever conducted about any environmental issue, and the research is being updated through tracking surveys every six months. Full results are available to Task Force members to develop the most effective national policy that ensures the protection of the, and conservation of the oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes. Based on this and related research, we believe that one of the best and most cost-effective ways to help promote better management and stewardship of the ocean is for the administration to focus more on education starting with children. After all, for any ocean policy effort to be successful in the long run, it will need the strong support of a broad base of engaged and well-informed citizens. Our nation needs to commit to a much greater, and a much more strategic investment in education. We believe that environmental literacy, including climate and ocean literacy, should be integrated as a critical component and goal of all agencies, departments, and strategies related to ocean stewardship and conservation in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, and the America Competes Act. The research is clear, aquariums are viewed as trusted authorities on environmental issues. The public is looking to these informal education centers to provide solutions to the issues facing the oceans, and we urge to --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap it up now.

BILL MOTT: ...work closely in cooperation with our network of aquariums, zoos, and museums, thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thanks. You're doing well, and I just wanted to remind you to keep it to two minutes.

BRIAN LOFTES: Brian Loftes, third generation commercial fisherman, amateur documentary maker. I'd like to say that with the fisheries management, and talking about the eco-based science, and managing fisheries that way, it's a good start, but when they reauthorize Magnuson, the environmental communities lobbied to get the definition of overfishing in there, and also lobbied to have all fisheries rebuilt by 2012 or '14, all to the historic level, at the same time, which any scientist will tell you is biologically impossible. We're never going to achieve it no matter which management plan we come up with. So, as that goes, the term overfishing keeps beating us over the head. We now have 170,000 metric tons of fish available out here to catch every year, and we're only harvesting 40 because of mismanagement, which is forcing the American people to import 85 percent of the seafood in this country. In most cases, that seafood is imported from countries that practice little or no conservation at all. When the United States is leading the world in conservation of fisheries' management, largest client size, least amount of days, closed areas. So, instead of the environmental communities and national marine fisheries champion the U.S. fishermen for our sacrifices, and letting us harvest the fish that have come back, they just keep beating us over the head. Pretty soon, there's going to be no fishermen left. It's already happening. I mean, I'd like to say I'm optimistic about our future in this, but I've been beaten over the head for 15 years, I've spent my whole life on the water. No one has more to gain or lose from a healthy fishery or ocean than myself and people that make a living off the ocean. So, I want you to think about that as you're going forward, because, to me, it's not a matter of if I go out of business, it's only a matter of when. And, I'll leave you with a little quote seeing how people are throwing quotes out there. "Government is not the solution to your problems, government is the problem. Ronald Reagan." (APPLAUSE)

LISA PIRES: Ma'am Chair, members of the -- thank you, thank you. Okay. Hello. Okay. My name is Lisa Pires, I am a concerned citizen, grew up in Revere, Massachusetts, one of the first, the nation's first national parks. Grew up on the beach. And, I'm here, I just want to finish, the, three points for safer waters in Massachusetts. There are three points, long-term sustainability, funding with mitigation money, and protection of sonar system of whales, which should be received with your special attention. We ask that you have the courage for the long-term sustainability of the, important resources should be ensured by balancing the needs of the conservation and development. And, funding with mitigation money is a pitfall the nation's ocean policy needs to avoid. There is definitely an incentive to permit any project with the fiscal future, and the agency may depend upon it. So, we thank you for your time, and ask you for your courage going forward to step out of the box and lead our nation into what we know we deserve, and what we can do with

the great brains that we do have in this nation. Thank you kindly. (APPLAUSE)

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. And will Harold Loftes, Boyce Thorne Miller, Pauline Cantwell, Tina Jackson, and Randy Swanson come up.

TINA JACKSON: Good evening, everybody, my name is Tina Jackson. Little closer? Is that better? Okay. Good evening, my name is Tina Jackson, and I'm a commercial fisherman from Point Judith, Rhode Island, and I'm one of the very few women who has the great opportunity to harvest fish from our oceans. Dr. Lubchenco made a recent comment in the Associated Press not too long ago that the future of fishing lies in local nets. And, when, in fact, the implementation of the new privatized sector policy on May 1st will be irradicating more than 50 percent of our fishing fleet that's still standing today. Before sectors were implemented for the crab fisheries in 2006-2007, out of the Bering Sea, there were approximately 285 boats. After sectors were implemented, there were approximately 80 to 85 working crab boats left, which blatantly implies that sectors put American fishermen out of work. Sectors are completely discriminating against the common pool electives, violating standards 1 through 10 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, specifically Standard 4. It also must be noted that some of the comments made by Maggie Mooney-Seus of National Marine Fisheries in regards to the massive flaws of data collection and understated catch histories, acknowledges that there are gross problems with that data, but there is no time to make any corrections, and they will still go forward, anyway, despite all the discrepancies with that flawed data. Each and every management plan that has been implemented by NOAA and National Marine Fisheries has been an utter failure for the last 33 years, and it is, it has been acknowledged by NOAA and National Marine Fisheries, and this management plan is set up to do just that, fail. What I have witnessed, and continue to witness, is not conservation by any means. The Magnuson-Stevens Act was implemented not only to sustain the fisheries, but to protect the fishermen, and the industry, itself. And this industry has been bled to death by our so-called environmental groups.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Could you wrap it up, please.

TINA JACKSON: Yep. I didn't think I went two minutes yet. For far too long, fishermen have been the patsy for environmental groups such as the EDF and Pew, who are majorly funded by unenvironmentally-friendly corporations such as Sunco Oil, and I wonder where Sunco Oil's political agenda lies, in saving fish and oceans, or making money. Thank you (APPLAUSE)

HAROLD LOFTES: Good evening. My name is Harold Loftes from Point Judith, Rhode Island. I've been a fisherman for 49 years now. And I'd like to address most of my comments to Dr. Lubchenco, and Pat Kirkel (phonetic). First of all, I'm not really against catch shares, I am against the way they were implemented. I believe that you have violated national Standard 4 of the Magnuson Act, and something will be done about it. You just heard from my nephew, Brian, about the total allowable fish of groundfish, 170,000 metric tons. 25 percent of that has been landed. You say that

reducing the boats is a national policy goal, and a significant fraction of the vessels need to be removed. What is this significant number? If you want to get rid of vessels, buy them back, or you should send out tents and food stamps, and I don't mean that as a joke. And, furthermore, if the pilot fishery fails in 2010, that will shut down sectors. If that doesn't happen, the yellow tails will shut down sectors. Somehow, I see this all destined to fail. Part of the fisheries policy by NOAA admits is elimination. I have a better explanation for that, and I call it genocide. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

DAVID REYNOLDS: And I'd like to call up, as the next speaker is coming up, I'd like to call up David Riley, Drew Carey -- Drew Carey is here? Caroline Karp, I'm sorry, Caroline Karp; Barbara Durkin; and Viviana Jimenez.

BOYCE THORNE MILLER: I'm Boyce Thorne Miller from the Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance. I want to thank you for coming, and for staying and listening to the last of us. The interim report is very encouraging. But, there needs to be a lot more detail, as I'm sure you're aware. The action detail is very critical. If this living, real document is to become living, real action. In turning to the marine spatial planning issues, the entire process, as has been said many times, must be ecosystem-based, and it must lead to ecosystem-based management across all activities. And, that must be done, the principles and guidelines for that must be done first. Multiple scales of complex marine ecosystems must be reflected in the governance and the management structures of the activities, themselves. The MSP must be as adaptable and flexible in time and space as the fluid environment and ecosystem processes dictate. MSP must recognize the unique interdependence of coastal communities with their fishermen, and marine ecosystems with their biodiversity. Communities must be part of the decision-making process, and must take on that responsibility. And don't forget the critical role of the ocean and its diverse life in sustaining the biosphere of the planet. This is becoming ever more critical as the land deteriorates, and so the ocean has to take over. MSP can be a basis for sound integrated decision making relative to uses of the environment, proposed uses of the ocean and its resources, but it should not be used as an excuse for cutting up the ocean amongst --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap up your comments.

BOYCE THORNE MILLER: ...conflicting uses. That will be a challenge.

DAVID RILEY: Thank you. That's great, thank you. Hi, I'm David Riley. I'm co-chair of a group called Head of the Bay Gateway, I'm going to try, in two minutes, to give you a little case study that might be useful, and some observations about it. We've been working for a couple of years to try to get a public destination that is a restaurant marine transportation center, and excursion boats in events based at a very small space next to India Point Park where you were this afternoon. Adjacent to, or contiguous with it, 1.4 acres. What we're up against, we made a very strong case, we got a lot of support, there have been polls taken, 89 percent of the people who responded to the polls, or 750 people, are for

public use of this space, 16 people, 2 percent, want condos there. There's, the condos would be outside of the hurricane barrier, at the bull's eye of where the storm surges have come in the past, in '38, and '54, especially, because Narragansett Bay is shaped like a funnel. And, since '54, a lot of wetlands, as I'm sure you know, have been filled in. So, the funnel is going to be even more powerful when it comes again. And yet, we have people proposing 12-story condos outside of the hurricane barrier at the bullseye of the storm surge. So, to, it's very clear that a wise spatial planning would be to have a vibrant public destination there, and there's a lot of interest in doing that. Why isn't it happening? What are we up against? Three things, I just want to quickly say. There is the transcends of hubris and myopia, or denial, which, I guess, are hard-wired in human beings. There's the lack of political power in the big picture. DOT says we need monies, state and federal, which they do. But, we help making the point to them that there's lots more land. In this case, in Providence, there's 18 acres behind this land that could be, that will be sold, and would be, actually, get more prices if you have a destination there. And, finally, the, we've gotten, we've heard from hurricane, Federal Hurricane Center, somebody told me, you're asking for trouble if you put condos out there. FEMA said, it's the Achilles heel of this area, but they won't be quoted.
DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap up your comments now.

DAVID RILEY: We need you to somehow find a way to inject backbone, and get that big picture so it doesn't fall through the cracks. Thank you.

CAROLINE KARP: Good evening. My name is Caroline Karp, I'm a senior lecturer at Brown University, an attorney, and the former director of the Narragansett Bay National Estuary Reserve. I want to thank the Task Force, of course, for providing this opportunity for public comment. I'm going to make an observation, an argument, and then offer three recommendations, and in that sequence. I want to note that within the past ten years, Rhode Island waters have been targeted by private developers for development of a deep water container port, average depth of Narragansett Bay is about 30 feet; two separate liquified natural gas facilities, one of those is still ongoing; a tide and wave energy project in Point Judith, now a wind farm off Block Island, and a wave to energy platform that would include, there would be a platform for a wind field in the federal waters right off our coast. And, what I wanted to suggest is, there are four LNG terminals today, marine-based terminals today, but two dozen, over two dozen LNG proposals in U.S. waters, two of those in Rhode Island waters. So, what I want to suggest is that, first of all, marine spatial zoning, marine spatial planning, which is essentially ocean zoning, is going to be a useful bureaucratic tool. Ocean zoning is very likely to prove helpful to channel and facilitate future development of the marine environment. However, and I want to stress this, in my view, there is absolutely no reason to believe that ocean zoning will result in environmentally protective distribution of industrial commercial uses of the marine environment. Consider how well zoning of coastal watersheds and Coastal Zone Management Act regulation of development in the coastal zone have actually protected water quality, marine life, and public trust uses of coastal waters. What I want to suggest is that zoning is simply not a substitute for national leadership on economically,

environmental, and ethically appropriate uses of the marine environment. I want to offer three recommendations very quickly, please.

DAVID REYNOLDS: I think you need to wrap it up.

CAROLINE KARP: I shall, it will be quick. The federal government needs to take leadership on developing a national energy plan so that we don't end up with LNG facilities and wind fields scattered throughout the nation's waters. Secondly, we need to ensure that private developers pay rents for long-term occupation of the seabed, and inference with competing uses of public trust resources of the water column. And, finally, we need to ensure that private developers assume permanent responsibility for maintenance and removal of obsolete capital infrastructure placed in the marine environment. Thank you very much.

BARBARA DURKIN: Hello, my name is Barbara Durkin, I'm a private citizen. Thank you very much for this opportunity, I appreciate your work, and I appreciate the ability to speak here. My concerns are several. On, zoning is police power intended to create law -- law, intended to create order, to prevent haphazard development, chaos, and, which brings me to Cape Wind. I'm very concerned about the project because of its siting by a private developer, too close to navigational lanes. You heard earlier from the Passenger Vessel Association, and I ask that you consider that the PVA is identified by U.S. Coast Guard Commandant Thad Allen as the private sector base of the port. Cape Wind is an F.A.A.-identified presumed hazard. There are three airports with 400,000 flights in the airspace are all opposed. The Fishing Association, Mass. Fisherman's Partnership, (inaudible), and sectors of the fishing industry considers this project would be a taking of their fishing grounds. It is an essential fish habitat, which is another consideration. My point is that there is existing use, and new introductions of different types of use have to be seriously considered. I hope that you consider Nantucket Sound as an area that you will zone off-limits to industrialization based on the conflicts. I'd like to say a word about the avian life, 6,600 birds have been predicted by Mass. Audubon staff scientists to be killed by Cape Wind. That happens to be 6,600 violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The harm to wildlife by wind turbines is immitigable on land. The technology does not exist to count carcasses over water, and that means that you can't monitor, so you can't mitigate what you can't monitor, and I ask you, please consider that. And also, avoid areas that are migratory fly-aways, as Secretary Salazar said, was quoted in --

DAVID REYNOLDS: Please wrap it up now.

BARBARA DURKIN: Thank you. ...was quoted just this week. Thank you.

VIVIANA JIMENEZ: Hello, my name is Viviana Jimenez, and I'm with the Blue Frontier Campaign. First, I would like to thank you for all your work, and offer our support. And just to keep it brief, since we're 40 minutes over already, we'd like to see as much transparency as possible during the process, during this process, but also during the process of policy implementation, and beyond. We believe that a national ocean council and policy will only truly work if there is the opportunity for great public

participation, as healthy oceans belong to all of us, and are also our responsibility. Thank you.

DREW CAREY: Good evening, thank you, the Task Force, for hanging in here this long. My name is Drew Carey, I'm a marine scientist, and a small business owner here in Rhode Island. I led a panel at the recent Coastal Zone Conference in Boston, we were trying to bring together marine mapping experts, as well as coastal managers, to try to identify needs in marine spatial planning. And I'm going to submit our findings from that workshop to you in writing, but I wanted to give you a few highlights tonight. We felt that it was very important to work to improve the linkage between the techniques we have for mapping, characterizing, and classifying marine environments, and the very specific needs of ecosystem-based management. There's actually quite a large gap there between these two needs. Specifics include the need for data standards, classification standards, mapping standards, and particularly, data portals that are designed to meet the needs of managers. On the other side, the management challenge is to define those needs sufficiently clearly to drive the data collection effort. Let me give you an example. One example is the need for assessment of critical, or essential habitat for fin fish, shellfish, and marine mammals. We're actually quite good at mapping the geological features of the sea floor, but we have no consistent method for translating these highly detailed maps into reliable maps of essential habitat. We require substantial research and development to consistently link the requirements of critical marine populations to the characteristics of the sea floor. That research will be useless if the results of mapping and population studies are not delivered in a coherent, consistent fashion to decision makers. I would like to ask, also, that the panel continue to encourage our vital marine technology industry, particularly the small businesses that drive new ideas, and new jobs. Thank you.

DAVID REYNOLDS: Thank you. And that completes the list of the people who signed up. So, I want to thank everybody, and I think we should give them a hand for contributing. (APPLAUSE)

DAVID REYNOLDS: And, as I said in the beginning, all of these comments have been recorded. And, also, people can send in their written comments online, on paper, or however they want. And, again, thank you. As we said, this is your resource, and we really appreciate your input. Should I ask if there's anything else?

NANCY SUTLEY: Yes, just, quickly. First of all, thank you to Dave Reynolds for doing a great job in getting us through the public comment. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

NANCY SUTLEY: To everyone, I see a lot of people stayed for the entire hearing, so, thank you very much for coming, and for sharing your thoughts with us. And thank you to all the staff, I know we had a lot of agencies who helped put this event together, we appreciate all that, and, to our great hosts here in Rhode Island. It has been very informative, very helpful, and I assure you that we are considering all your comments, and

thank you very much for coming. I think we're done.
(APPLAUSE)

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, SHELLEY L. DEMING, Notary Public, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the foregoing proceedings, and that the foregoing transcript contains a true, accurate, and complete record of the proceedings at the above-entitled meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 1st day of December, 2009.

_____

SHELLEY L. DEMING, NOTARY PUBLIC/CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: April 24, 2011

IN RE: INTERAGENCY OCEAN POLICY TASK FORCE PUBLIC MEETING

DATE: September 24, 2009